

the exemption for dependents from \$500 to \$800; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOWELL:

H. R. 3955. A bill to establish the peace force and to stimulate volunteer enlistments for occupation duties; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KNUTSON:

H. R. 3956. A bill to repeal the act establishing daylight-saving time; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 3957. A bill to repeal the War Labor Disputes Act; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 3958. A bill to continue in effect the reemployment rights of veterans after the termination of other provisions of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PRICE of Illinois:

H. R. 3959. A bill to provide for the burial in the Memorial Amphitheater of the National Cemetery at Arlington, Va., of the remains of an unknown American soldier who lost his life while serving overseas in the armed forces of the United States during the Second World War; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 3960. A bill to adopt generally September 16, 1940, date of enactment of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as the beginning date of World War II for the purposes of all benefits under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. RANKIN (by request):

H. R. 3961. A bill to amend the Social Security Act, as amended, to provide for the payment of monthly insurance benefits to widows of individuals who died before January 1, 1940; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 3962. A bill to establish a Division of Printing Control in the Office of the Bureau of the Budget, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma:

H. R. 3963. A bill to make the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code granting percentage depletion with respect to fluorspar permanent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3964. A bill to amend Public Law 403, Seventy-seventh Congress; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. R. 3965. A bill to amend the National Housing Act and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. J. Res. 233. Joint resolution for acquisition of British islands in the Caribbean and British Honduras; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. J. Res. 234. Joint resolution for the acquisition of French islands in the Caribbean and the North Atlantic Ocean; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PRICE of Illinois:

H. J. Res. 235. Joint resolution to provide for termination of the act of January 20, 1942, providing for daylight-saving time; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. Con. Res. 78. Concurrent resolution to repeal Public Law 403, and reinstate standard time provided in the act entitled "An act to save daylight and to provide standard time for the United States," approved March 19, 1918, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma:

H. Con. Res. 79. Concurrent resolution setting the date for the discontinuation of daylight-saving time; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ALLEN of Illinois:

H. Res. 337. Resolution inviting Lieutenant General Wainwright to appear before a joint session of Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. Res. 338. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 1862, a bill relating to the rank of chiefs of bureaus in the Navy Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the National Constituent Assembly of El Salvador, expressing its joy over the victory, and hopes for the establishment of a lasting peace; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the House of Representatives of Colombia, sending greetings on the occasion of a new anniversary of the glorious independence of the United States of America; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the House of Deputies of Peru, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States with regard to the Government of Spain; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Chamber of Deputies of Peru, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States with regard to the establishment of diplomatic and commercial relations with the Union of the Soviet Socialist Republics; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Grand National Assembly of Turkey, expressing joy over the unconditional surrender of Japan; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Congress of Costa Rica, expressing satisfaction at the cessation of hostilities; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BUNKER:

H. R. 3966. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands situated in Clark County, Nev., to the Boulder City Cemetery Association for cemetery purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. CANNON of Florida:

H. R. 3967. A bill for the relief of Ahto Walter, Lucy Walter, and Teddy Walter; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 3968. A bill for the relief of the estate of Charles W. Stewart; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FALLON:

H. R. 3969. A bill for the relief of Robert E. Barry; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LANDIS:

H. R. 3970. A bill for the relief of John Hames; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey:

H. R. 3971. A bill for the relief of Charles A. Clark; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1120. By Mr. WELCH: Resolution No. 4858 of Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco, urging retention of steel plants on the Pacific coast; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1121. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the South Dakota Reclamation Association, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the land and water resources of the Missouri River Basin, and other pertinent

projects; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

1122. Also, petition of the American Legion of Kings County, Department of New York, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the reemployment of World War II veterans, to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1123. Also, petition of the president, chamber of commerce, Houston, Tex., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to urging the amendment of H. R. 3603; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1124. Also, petition of the board of supervisors, Kern County, Calif., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to continued operations of steel plants on the Pacific coast; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1125. Also, petition of the South Central Jurisdictional Council of the Methodist Church, Texarkana, Tex., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to their protest to the passage during the war of universal compulsory military training as a peacetime measure; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1126. Also, petition of the Tennessee Business Men's Association, Inc., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to taxation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1127. Also, petition of the Illinois State CIO Political Action Committee, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to their endorsement of the Wagner-Murray-Dingell social security bill, and other pertinent legislation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1128. Also, petition of Mrs. Blanche Tucker, Burwell, Nebr., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to House bills 2229 and 2230 and Senate bills 690 and 809; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1129. Also, petition of the Peace Campaign, Mount Vernon, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to a Christian peace in Europe; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1130. Also, petition of Local 72, United Automobile-Aircraft-Agricultural Implement Workers of America (UAW-CIO), petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the contribution by the Federal Government to the social-security fund of moneys equal to earnings of \$50 per week for the period of all enlistments, inductions or commissions in the armed forces of the United States in time of war, to include the present conflict; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1131. Also, petition of the board of water commissioners, Denver, Colo., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to their disapproval of House bill 555; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

SENATE

MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 10, 1945

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, we thank Thee for the glory of this shining hour as the mute gates of torture and tyranny are battered down and, leading captivity captive, men of valor return in honor from pagan lands of living death. Our glad hearts rejoice that each new day the speaking air records the reign of ruthless invaders ended, ancient liberties restored, and prostrate peoples standing once again on their feet.

In this hour of triumph and proud sorrow, with victory stained yet glorified by the blood of our dearest, we seek Thy guidance as, facing the peril as well as the privilege of peace, we resolve as a people under God to do nothing unworthy of those who have died for us and to make the world such a world as they would have desired and of which they dreamed for their children and ours. In the Redeemer's name we ask it. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, September 6, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF WILLIAM E. ORR, OF NEVADA, TO BE JUDGE OF THE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Monday, September 17, 1945, at 10 a. m., in the Senate Judiciary Committee room, upon the nomination of William E. Orr, of Nevada, to be judge of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, vice Hon. Curtis D. Wilbur, retired. At the indicated time and place, all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], chairman, the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY].

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF DELBERT E. METZGER TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE, DISTRICT OF HAWAII

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Monday, September 17, 1945, at 10 a. m., in the Senate Judiciary Committee room, upon the nomination of Hon. Delbert E. Metzger, of Hawaii, to be United States district judge for the District of Hawaii—reappointment.

At the indicated time and place, all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], chairman, the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY].

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF MARTIN PENCE TO BE A JUDGE OF THE THIRD CIRCUIT, CIRCUIT COURTS, HAWAII

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary,

and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Monday, September 17, 1945, at 10 a. m., in the Senate Judiciary Committee room, upon the nomination of Martin Pence, of Hawaii, to be a judge of the Third Circuit, Circuit Courts, Territory of Hawaii, vice Hon. Ray J. O'Brien, resigned.

At the indicated time and place, all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], chairman, the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY].

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF BEN H. RICE, JR., TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE, WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Monday, September 17, 1945, at 10 a. m., in the Senate Judiciary Committee room, upon the nomination of Ben H. Rice, Jr., of Texas, to be United States district judge for the western district of Texas, vice Hon. Walter A. Keeling, deceased.

At the indicated time and place, all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], chairman, the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY].

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gurney	Murray
Andrews	Hart	O'Daniel
Bailey	Hatch	O'Mahoney
Ball	Hayden	Overton
Barkley	Hickenlooper	Radcliffe
Bilbo	Hill	Reed
Brewster	Hoey	Revercomb
Briggs	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Brooks	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Buck	Kilgore	Saltonstall
Burton	Knowland	Smith
Byrd	La Follette	Stewart
Capper	Lucas	Taft
Carville	McCarran	Taylor
Chandler	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Connally	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Cordon	McKellar	Tunnell
Donnell	McMahon	Vandenberg
Downey	Magnuson	Wagner
Ellender	Maybank	Walsh
Ferguson	Mead	Wherry
Fulbright	Millikin	White
George	Moore	Wiley
Gerry	Morse	Young
Guffey	Murdoch	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MITCHELL], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS],

the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is absent on official business.

Mr. WHERRY. The following Senators are necessarily absent: The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON].

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] are absent because of illness.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-four Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

CONGRATULATIONS ON VICTORY OVER JAPAN BY CHAMBER OF DEPUTIES OF EGYPT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a radiogram from Hamed, president of the Chamber of Deputies of Egypt, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EGYPT.

SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, Washington:

In the name of the Chamber of Deputies I am very happy to congratulate you and the Representatives to the whole American people on your magnificent and decisive victory over Japan, which was a victory of strength, liberty, and character over treachery, oppression, and perfidy. We are glad that Egypt participated during the war with all the means in its power in the service of the cause of democracy, of which you bear the standard, and for the triumph of which you have used inconceivable efforts. Long live the United States, the bastion of democracy, the champion of liberty and of the independence of all nations.

HAMED,

President of the Chamber of Deputies.

REPORT OF SECRETARY OF WAR ON GOVERNMENT TRANSPORTATION INCIDENT TO THE PROSECUTION OF THE WAR

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, pursuant to section 2 of Public Law No. 779 Seventy-seventh Congress, a report covering transportation for certain Government and other personnel necessary for the successful prosecution of the war, for the period from July 1, 1944, to June 30, 1945, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate petitions, which were referred as indicated:

The petitions of Oscar A. L. Blenman, of New York City, N. Y., and John E. Lund,

of Palisades, N. J., praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 380) to establish a national policy and program for assuring continuing full employment in a free competitive economy, through the concerted efforts of industry, agriculture, labor, State, and local governments, and the Federal Government; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A letter in the nature of a petition from the W. I. V. E. S., Inc., of New York City, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation to provide full employment, adequate housing, and public health as postwar measures; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

CERTAIN AUTHORITY FOR WAR LABOR BOARD TO ADJUST WAGES

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred a resolution I have received from local union No. 184 B, United Retail, Wholesale, and Department Store Employees of America, CIO, Kansas City, Kans., requesting that authority be given the War Labor Board to grant wage adjustments, lift substandard level to a 65-cent minimum, and assure maintenance of the high level of purchasing power of employees.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the cost of living has skyrocketed in this area, and it is becoming increasingly impossible to maintain a decent standard of living so long as the costs of food, rent, and clothing remain where they now are; and

Whereas members of our organization are being faced with lowered income, due to cancellation of government contracts, lower take home wages; and

Whereas the majority of the membership of local union 184 B, United Retail, Wholesale and Department Store Employees of America, CIO have had our wages frozen through the establishment of so-called wage brackets, or so-called sound and tested going rates, and have not received sufficient wage increases through the operation of the Little Steel Formula; and

Whereas this unfair action was instituted by government procedure and has tended to cause strife and unrest among our membership, and we find ourselves at constant log-heads with management; and

Whereas the membership of local union 184 B, URWDSEA-CIO are employed by Bright Biscuit Company, a company engaged principally in civilian production, and whose wage scale was never sufficient to meet the cost of living before Pearl Harbor and who consequently gained little through the fifteen (15) percent allowed by the Little Steel formula; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the membership of local union 184 B, URWDSEA-CIO go on record demanding that Executive Order No. 9328 be immediately revoked, and in its place be established the following: That the War Labor Board be given authority to grant wage adjustments which would (1) aid in the effective prosecution of the war; (2) life the substandard level to 65 cents minimum; (3) assure maintenance of the high level of purchasing power of employees involved; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to President Harry S. Truman; Philip Murray, President of the CIO; Allan Haywood, CIO Director of Organization; Irwin DeShetler, CIO Regional Director; Senators George Briggs, Forrest Donnell of Missouri,

and Arthur Capper, Kansas; C. Jasper Bell and Roger Slaughter, members of Congress from Missouri, and Errett Scrivner of Kansas.

Resolution adopted by Local Union 184B United Retail, Wholesale and Department Store Employees of America, CIO, at its regular meeting held July 30, 1945.

DON L. SCOTT,
President.
MAUDE ZUZICH,
Recording Secretary.

PROTEST AGAINST NATURALIZATION OF HARRY BRIDGES

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I am bringing to the attention of the Senate and asking unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred a resolution adopted by the Kansas Department of the American Legion on September 3, 1945, at their annual meeting at Topeka, Kansas, in which the Legion goes on record as opposed to the naturalization of Harry Bridges.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Immigration and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas we are informed that Harry Bridges is an agitator and an undesirable alien—

Who has been guilty of and participated in subversive activities against the people and Government of the United States;

Who has called, aided and abetted unlawful strikes, fostered strife and violence in labor and essential war industries, and otherwise interfered with the war effort in the present emergency;

Who is a member of or is affiliated with a party or organization advocating the overthrow of the duly constituted authority and Government of the United States and its people: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Kansas Department of the American Legion, in regular meeting assembled:

First. That the Kansas Department of the American Legion protests against the naturalization of Harry Bridges as a citizen of the United States, demands that his application for citizenship be denied, and requests that the Government of the State of Kansas, and the Senators and Representatives from Kansas in Congress, leave nothing undone to secure a denial of the application of Harry Bridges for citizenship.

Second. That a certified copy of this resolution be transmitted to the Governor of the State of Kansas, to each Senator and Representative from Kansas in Congress, and the National Department of the American Legion.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (S. 1365) to amend section 35 of the Bankruptcy Act to permit the appointment of supervising conciliation commissioners as referees in bankruptcy, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 556) thereon.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:
S. 1369. A bill to amend Public Law 322 of the Seventy-second Congress, second session, with respect to Indian land titles; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. BAILEY:

S. 1370. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide reemployment rights for persons who leave their positions to serve in the merchant marine, and for other purposes," approved June 23, 1943 (57 Stat. 162) and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. DOWNEY:

S. 1371. A bill for the relief of Reginald Mitchell; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1372. A bill to officially name the flood-control project authorized by Public Law 534, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved December 22, 1944 on Lytle and Cajon Creeks near San Bernardino, Calif., the Sheppard floodway; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 1373. A bill for the relief of Commander Warren Sherman Parr, United States Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. McKELLAR (for himself and Mr. EASTLAND):

S. 1374. A bill for the relief of the estate of Mary B. Buckley (with accompanying papers);

S. 1375. A bill for the relief of the estate of Chambers H. Buckley (with accompanying papers); and

S. 1376. A bill for the relief of Alice Randolph (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 1377. A bill for the relief of Raymond J. McMahon; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

EXCERPTS FROM TESTIMONY ON FULL EMPLOYMENT BILL

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, during the recent hearings of the Banking and Currency Committee on the full employment bill, S. 380, there was much discussion of whether the Government's responsibility should be to "assure" continuing full employment, or merely to "encourage" continuing full employment.

One of the ablest witnesses testifying before the committee was the Honorable Fred M. Vinson, the distinguished Secretary of the Treasury. Mr. Vinson pointed out that the concept of "assurance" is vital to the full employment bill, and to the full employment program.

Let me quote Secretary Vinson:

We must face the fact that all of us have a responsibility to see that our economic system works efficiently, that there are jobs for men and women able and willing to work. When we are confronted with problems of national scope involving collective responsibility we must look to the National Government, acting for all the people to take the leadership in their solution.

Let there be no misunderstanding as to the meaning of the word "assure." It is more than a mere pious hope—a mere paper promise to be kept to the ear and broken to the hope. It means the assumption of a definite moral responsibility. It does not, of course, mean that every individual will be led by the hand from one job to another.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the RECORD at this point, together with my remarks, a set of statements made during the recent hearings on the necessity of our assuring continuing full employment. These quotations include the statement of Secretary Vinson, and of other national leaders from all walks of life.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM SENATE BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE TESTIMONY ON FULL EMPLOYMENT BILL (S. 380) RELATING TO THE GOVERNMENT'S RESPONSIBILITY TO ASSURE CONTINUING FULL EMPLOYMENT¹

Hon. Clinton Anderson, Secretary of Agriculture (p. 522):

"If we are to have full employment, as I believe we must have, the Federal Government will have to assume the responsibility for maintaining it. This bill (S. 380) recognizes this fact. There is no one segment of our economy which can provide the necessary guaranties. Yet all of us, farmers, businessmen, laborers—producers and consumers alike—can, together, through the instrumentality of our democratic Government, assure the maintenance of full production and, hence, full employment.

"The assurance that Government is committed to a policy of maintaining full employment, within the framework of our free-enterprise system, is one of the greatest encouragements that Government can give to individual producers. They will know that with a fully employed labor force there will be a market for their particular products."

Clarence Avidsen, chairman of the board, Republic Drill & Tool Co., Chicago, Ill. (p. 657):

"Everyone knows that the businessman cannot guarantee continuous employment for his workers. So if this is true, and if we grant that men and women in a free society must be assured an opportunity to obtain remunerative employment, the job of assuring this employment must rest upon the only institution which has authority over all of us which is subject to our collective will—the Government of the United States."

Mrs. J. B. Caulkins, president, Young Women's Christian Association (pp. 977-978):

"A positive declaration of the intention of the Government to protect the basic right of its people to engage in useful, remunerative work, is an assurance that the workers of this country expect and have the right to expect. It is an assurance that private enterprise should also welcome, because it supports continuous purchasing power and lessens the threat of sudden fluctuations and of depressions that have hovered over business and worker alike."

Miss Loula Dunn, president, American Public Welfare Association, and commissioner of the department of public welfare, State of Alabama (p. 441):

"As I understand the bill, it proposes really to guarantee that there will be full employment, which is an insurance against the very social hazards and problems that I have been talking about. Certainly out of the experience I have had in seeing what happened to people when they did not have economic security, I would be one of the people who would wish to raise my voice in behalf of any measures that would guarantee that there would be that type of employment. I think not enough has been said on the social consequences in broken homes and crime and prison population, all the byproducts of long-time unemployment, as well as your byproducts in the health of the community, which was amply demonstrated, I think, in the number of rejections for physical reasons in the draft."

Harry Golden, president, Magna Products, New York, N. Y. (p. 616):

"I am for this bill because:

¹ Sec. 2 (b) of S. 380: All Americans able to work and seeking work have the right to useful, remunerative, regular, and full-time employment, and it is the policy of the United States to assure the existence at all times of sufficient employment opportunities to enable all Americans * * * freely to exercise this right.

"4. It places on the Federal Government the definite responsibility of avoiding unemployment.

"Where else can this responsibility be placed?

"Not on business. My plant employs 150 men and women. How can I hire any more unless I feel that I will be able to sell what these extra people would produce?

"The responsibility for unemployment can't very well be placed on the employee. He can't create jobs.

"The last decade certainly should have taught us that, when depression comes, no one but the Federal Government can assume the prime responsibility for relief. Hasn't the fire department the duty of preventing conditions that may cause or spread fire?

"It aims to give every businessman what he needs most—assurance of a market. Now, let us dwell for a moment on those most important words, 'assurance of a market.' I cannot attempt to tell you how important those four words are.

"Fortune magazine said 7 years ago:

"Every businessman who is not kidding himself knows that he does not know how to guarantee without Government intervention the markets with which alone his free competitive capitalism can function. Every businessman who is not kidding himself knows that, if left to its own devices, business would sooner or later run headlong into another 1930."

"Now, when a little fellow quotes from Fortune magazine he thinks he has a real argument, that he has something worth while."

L. E. Keller, research director, Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, Detroit, Mich. (p. 985):

"It is our position that the Federal Government has both the right and the absolute duty to concern itself with the behavior of private enterprise to the extent that its activities have any important bearing on the social and economic well-being of the country as a whole, or upon the political well-being of the country. And I want to repeat there that it is not only the right but we insist that it is the absolute duty of the Federal Government to do that.

"We cannot escape social and economic disaster in the days ahead of us, we think, by any program of timidity or delay or evasion."

Florence H. LaGuardia, mayor of New York City (p. 866):

"Senator TOBEY. Before you get to that may I point out in paragraph b the word 'assure.' It is the policy of the Nation to assure the existence—that has been a very moot word here. People have come before us and questioned the word 'assure'; tried to get around it by using some other language, and so forth.

"Is it your thought it is the very intent of the bill to assure?"

"Mayor LA GUARDIA. Well, you either assure their existence by employment or you assure their subsistence by relief."

Col. William C. Menninger, United States Army, Chief, Psychiatric Division, War Department; psychiatrist with Menninger Clinic, Topeka, Kans., pages 676, 678:

"With demobilization of the Army and war industries unemployment will confront us shortly, and not only will we have the inherent problems of unemployment but these will directly contribute to making many of this group of veterans into confirmed invalids. If there were assurance of sustained employment opportunities for all, this possibility would be of less concern."

"So that I think unemployment has had a tremendous impact and will continue to have if we do not bring about some kind of a positive assurance that a man shall have an opportunity to get a job if he can."

Hon. JAMES E. MURRAY, junior Senator from the State of Montana (p. 9 and 12):

"The full-employment bill is based upon the theory that no single group in the country—either industry, labor, or agriculture—can by itself assure the expanding markets which are necessary for full production and full employment. The bill recognizes the fact that only the Government, acting in cooperation with industry, labor, agriculture, and States and localities, can assure a continuing level of demand sufficient to absorb the goods and services produced under our modern economic conditions.

"In short, the so-called right to a job is a meaningless figure of speech unless our Government assumes responsibility for the expansion of our peacetime economy so that it will be capable of assuring full employment."

Senator MURRAY (in the course of Ralph Flanders' testimony):

"Webster's Dictionary gives as a definition of the word 'assure': 'To make sure or certain; to inspire confidence by declaration or promise.'

"Mr. FLANDERS. That second definition of it, Senator, is applicable a hundred percent.

"Mr. MURRAY. It also says: 'To confirm; to give confidence to.'"

Philip Murray, president, Congress of Industrial Organizations, Washington, D. C. (p. 510):

"The words 'assure' and 'sufficient' are very desirable. (We should) accept no substitutes such as 'promote' or 'encourage' for 'assure' * * * or 'substantial' for 'sufficient'."

Charles F. Palmer, president, Palmer, Inc., Atlanta, Ga. (p. 727):

"In opposition to the view of Mr. Mosher that this bill will help to bring about depression, I feel that its enactment will help to give assurance to those who fear they will lose their jobs and to those industrialists who believe they will not be able to carry on. There may be some who may oppose such assurance being given industry as well as employees, because there are some in industry who may say they would prefer to have it out with labor now."

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN, Representative from the First District of Texas (pp. 54-55):

"While clear-cut objectives are indispensable, they are not enough. Our people want and need some assurance that we will not only talk about the twin goals of full employment and free competitive enterprise, but that we shall also attain them.

"During the great depression, the Federal Government had to undertake the responsibility of doing whatever was necessary to prevent destitution and starvation, a responsibility hitherto regarded as the province of private charity and local government. Today the average man and woman feel that their Government is also obligated to do whatever is necessary to prevent unemployment and to maintain full employment in a free competitive economy. The full-employment bill recognizes this obligation.

"The bill makes it the responsibility of the Federal Government, in cooperation with business, labor, agriculture, State governments, and local governments, to assure our people conditions under which they can exercise their right to work as freemen in a free society."

James G. Patton, president, National Farmers Union (p. 569):

"What is essential is the underwriting of confidence. When President Roosevelt many years ago told us that all we had to fear was fear itself he was stating a basic proposition. Now, as then, fear is our greatest enemy. What we must search out is the way to universal confidence, the way to make businessmen lose their fear of risking capital, to make consumers lose their fear of spending, to make all of us live in confidence and well-founded hope for the future.

"That is all that depressions are anyway—the expression of mass fear. Once the Nation has found a way to end that fear, then it will have found the way to permanent full employment and prosperity."

The Most Reverend Bernard J. Shell, D. D., auxiliary bishop of Chicago, and director of the Catholic Youth Organization, archdiocese of Chicago (p. 838):

"But it is the primary and essential function of government to secure citizens in the peaceful enjoyment of their natural rights; every government has the bounden duty to see to it that men are not denied the fundamental right of providing for themselves and their dependents a decent livelihood by honest and efficient labor. If, therefore, private industry is unable to afford men the opportunity of a decent and honorable living, government is bound by its very nature to employ all its resources to secure to all citizens this essential right to work. Again Pope Leo XIII is pertinent:

"It is the first duty of every government to make sure that the laws and institutions, the general character and administration of the commonwealth, are such as to produce of themselves public well-being and private prosperity. Above all, the public administration must duly and solicitously provide for the welfare and the comfort of the working people."

Harold D. Smith, Director of the Budget, Washington, D. C. (p. 903):

"Assurance of full-employment opportunities, of course, does not mean a guarantee of specific jobs. It means, rather, that the Government will pursue policies to assure job opportunities for those willing and able to work. In an expanding economy, changes are bound to occur in the type and location of jobs. Some opportunities vanish while others are created. The bill anticipates that there will be time intervals between old and new jobs. Shifts may require retraining or migration. In other words, some 'fictional' employment is inevitable.

"A policy declaration by the Congress is, in itself, an important factor in attaining the goals of a full-employment program. Assurance of full employment is identical with assurance of sustained markets and confidence, the main prerequisites for business investment and a high level of employment opportunities."

Hon. Fred M. Vinson, Secretary of the Treasury (pp. 952-953):

"Too frequently, in the past, it has been popular to place the blame for depression on the businessman.

"But no businessman can continue to employ labor and to produce goods unless he finds a market for his output at a remunerative price. The fact is that if any businessman continued for an extended time to produce goods for which there are no buyers, he would inevitably incur such losses that he could not stay in business. For this reason, businessmen cannot assume the responsibility to keep producing goods and employing labor in the face of an inadequate demand for their products.

"Clearly it cannot be the responsibility of businessmen alone to prevent unemployment. But that is not to say there is no responsibility anywhere to prevent unemployment. We cannot assume that depressions are acts of God, that they are a burden men must inevitably bear. We must face the fact that all of us have a responsibility to see that our economic system works efficiently, that there are jobs for men and women able and willing to work. When we are confronted with problems of national scope involving collective responsibility we must look to the National Government, acting for all the people to take the leadership in their solution.

"Let there be no misunderstanding as to the meaning of the word 'assure.' It is more than a mere pious hope—a mere paper prom-

ise to be kept to the ear and broken to the hope. It means the assumption of a definite moral responsibility. It does not, of course, mean that every individual will be led by the hand from one job to another."

F. R. von Windeger, president, the Plaza Bank of St. Louis, St. Louis, Mo. (p. 647):

"The most enlightened business leaders today acknowledge that business alone, in this machine age, cannot furnish full employment to all those able to and seeking work.

"Therefore, full employment being necessary to the continued existence of our economic and political system and necessary for the general welfare, it becomes incumbent upon the Government to take whatever steps are necessary to fill the gap left by private enterprise."

Hon. Henry A. Wallace, Secretary of Commerce, Washington, D. C. (pp. 692, 694, 696):

"No individual firm, however, should be expected to employ people producing goods or services for which it cannot find a market at a reasonable price. That assurance of adequate market opportunity, which is essential to full production and employment, is the responsibility of all the people, including business management, acting through their chosen representatives in Government.

"It is only the assurance that the Government will use its financial power to prevent shrinking markets that will induce business to continue to produce at full employment levels. Without this assurance and without Government implementation of it, we are sure to see the familiar spectacle of inventory liquidation, cutthroat competition, stoppage of investment programs, mounting unemployment, and farm foreclosures whenever deflationary forces are unloosed."

"Senator TOBEY. I was impressed by the fact that all through your statement, at least 8 or 10 times, you definitely used the words 'give assurance.' I merely ask you this in view of the controversy that has arisen in this committee; do you agree with the authors of the bill, of whom I am one, that the purpose of this bill is to assure—give assurance of opportunities? Is that right?"

"Mr. WALLACE. That is right.

"Senator TOBEY. And the word means just what it says, assure them an opportunity to work.

"Mr. WALLACE. An opportunity; yes. But not any specific job to any specific individual."

James P. Warburg, Greenwich, Conn. (p. 665):

"Those who oppose the bill do so because they oppose the fundamental principle that it has now become both the right and the duty of the American people, acting together through their Government, to make the right to work as much a reality as the right of free speech.

"Let the vote be taken on that principle."

Walter H. Wheeler, Jr., president, Pitney-Bowes, Inc., Stamford, Conn. (pp. 828 and 829):

"I support the underlying principle of this bill, because I am convinced that it is the definite and inescapable responsibility of Government, in a modern society, to see that stable economic conditions prevail affording a high level of employment.

"In the past, action usually has been taken only after some calamity has occurred. This bill puts on Government the responsibility of planning to avoid calamity.

"I do not believe that the private-enterprise system, left entirely to its own devices in our present-day complex economic system, can avoid cyclical fluctuations, the low points of which are so severe as to bring about extended mass unemployment such as existed in the thirties.

"Of itself, private enterprise has not the power to command widespread action in times of crisis, or to sufficiently influence its

membership to avoid crisis. Whether we like it or not, we have reached a point where, despite the risks, we must depend upon Government as the only possible authority to broadly coordinate our activities, to use some of its power directly when necessary, and to plan for us. The only solution lies in wise and sound government. The only logical course open to those who fear government is to do their utmost to improve government. If this attitude is not taken, I am convinced that we will finally end up with all government in a socialized state."

JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I submit a concurrent resolution to create an economic high command for the United States Congress. It will not be called that; it will be called a Joint Committee on the Budget, but its effect will be the same. If agreed to, it will give the United States Congress for the first time in its history the long-range eyes, ears, and voice to play its role adequately in handling the economy of our Nation.

The reasons for this joint committee are obvious:

First. Without it, Congress will continue to lack the economic high command with which to meet the administration high command on its own terms.

Too long have we been "weak sisters" in our equipment with which to evaluate the administration's carefully prepared demands for appropriations.

We already have a Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation to handle the income side of the American ledger. That joint committee has long proved its indispensability. Why, then, should we not have a Joint Committee on the Budget with which to handle the outgo side of the ledger?

The Senate has adopted a resolution to establish a joint committee to investigate the Pearl Harbor disaster. Moreover, there has been proposed a joint committee to investigate the development and control of the atomic bomb. Why, then, should we not have a Joint Committee on the Budget, which would prevent a financial Pearl Harbor—a financial disaster that could blow our way of life sky high?

Second. Right now we are in a position of grave financial stress.

Our national debt is still mounting from its present peak of \$262,000,000,000. Right now a debt of over \$1,870 hangs over every man, woman, and child in our country. A debt of over \$4,170 hangs over every employed worker in our country.

According to revised Budget estimates, our deficit will increase by thirty billions this fiscal year. That is at the rate of \$2,500,000,000 a month, or at the rate of more than \$10 a month on every man, woman, and child or at the rate of more than \$42 a month on every employed worker.

Our \$262,000,000,000 of national debt are owned by the people. The bonds covering that debt are held by individuals and by institutions which have the people's life savings.

Who, specifically, holds those bonds? Here is a table which shows who held the bonds, as of April 30, 1945, when our national debt stood at a sum in excess of \$238,000,000,000:

<i>Billions of bonds</i>	
Banks.....	106.7
Individuals.....	53.8
Corporations and associations.....	25.8
U. S. Government agencies and trust funds.....	23.2
Insurance companies.....	20.5
State and local governments.....	4.3
	<hr/> 234.3

Peril the solvency of our Government and you peril the solvency of every bank, every insurance company, every organization and individual in America. That peril is not an idle speculation. It is a grave possibility.

The false economic philosophy which has permeated America for the last 12 years must be rooted out. Deficit financing must cease.

Third. The minimum Budget needs of America for essential services are of staggering proportions.

In the coming period we will have huge expenditures for such essential items as:

(a) Payment of interest on the Federal debt.

(b) Gradual repayment of the principal of the Federal debt.

(c) Provision for aid to disabled veterans, widows, and orphans of ex-servicemen.

(d) National defense.

(e) Minimum Government services, such as old-age pensions, compensation for the blind, and so forth.

The minimum billions of dollars required for these items will cost far more than we have ever raised in revenues. The greatest amount of Government revenue ever raised prior to 1941 was in 1938, when we raised five and one-half billion dollars. But the debt items alone of our coming Federal Budget will cost us far more than five and one-half billion dollars.

Having determined the essential categories of Federal expenditure, we dare not scrimp on them. We dare not "sock the disabled veteran" or break the back of our national defense as we did after the last war by penny-wise, pound-foolish "thriff."

We dare not allow essential items such as these to go begging. With regard to national defense, our own preparedness is still our best security. The United Nations Organization is still in diapers and cannot be relied upon exclusively.

The nations, such as Russia, are hardly putting their armed forces in moth balls. We must continue to surpass the power of every other nation on earth if we would sleep peacefully at night in this jungle world.

Fourth. The heat is being put on Congress for unnecessary expenditures of staggering proportions.

How can we ever expect to spend adequately for the essential services stated above if we are going to pour money into every financial rat hole promoted by self-interest groups?

Every scrambled brain in the country, every wild-eyed dreamer and diabolic schemer is out to take Uncle Sam for a ride for every dollar Uncle Sam's printing press can print. The screams for hand-outs are deafening Congress' ears.

"Spend—spend—spend."

"Legislate the millennium into existence."

"Pass a law that will enable every American to sit back on his haunches and draw Federal checks while jobs go begging."

"Pass a law that will give every American, on a silver platter, a job at the salary he fancies, of the importance he fancies."

"Finance everything by deficit, by printing-press money."

"Keep blowing up the Government debt balloon. Do not worry about it bursting."

"Cram Federal hand-outs and control down the State and local governments' throats whether they like it or not."

These are the thoughts expressed by selfish self-seekers who present many-point ultimatums to Congress to "spend or else."

The vast amount of synthetic spend-crazy legislation which these self-seekers are demanding must not be allowed to be hidden behind a smoke screen during the coming months and steam-rollered through. The Pearl Harbor investigation will be occupying our attention and must not serve as such a smoke screen behind which ruinous laws are simultaneously pushed.

Where is the money to come from for all the spending that has been proposed? How are we going to pay for it? The highest estimates for this year's revenues are only \$36,000,000,000. Yet expenditures will be \$66,000,000,000, leaving a deficit of \$30,000,000,000.

Postwar budgets, even without provision for extra spending, contemplate that we will be spending, at a minimum, about every cent we may expect to take in by taxes and more. How, then, can we expect to add the extra load of more spending on top of the minimum Budget? How are we going to balance the Budget? How are we going to reduce taxes on the long-overburdened taxpayers?

Let us think the answers to these questions through. Let us create this Joint Committee on the Budget to help us think and act our way through. Let us also do these things:

First. Speed the demobilization of our armed forces. When we release into civilian life the men with jobs and the men who make jobs, these men will add to the potential tax revenue, instead of continuing to drain it. Get the doctors, the dentists, the lawyers, and other professionals and technicians in particular back into our economy which so desperately needs them. I have already written to President Truman respectfully urging that every effort be made to speed up the release of these men.

Second. Scrap the useless bureaus and slash the overstuffed departments in the Federal Government.

Third. Encourage the local communities and the people to look to their own sweat and toil for their prosperity, rather than to Federal pap. Relearn the lesson of our fathers—depending on ourselves rather than on the Federal Government for our salvation.

Return to the States the constitutional powers thereof which have been taken over by the Federal Government. Let the communities and the States rid

themselves of the false notion that they should look to Washington for economic aid in the solution of those problems which are in their nature local and State-wide. The State and local governments are in a far better financial position to look after their respective needs than is the Federal Government.

End the imported European pattern of thinking, with its hatred and intolerance between classes and groups. Let us breathe the free, harmonious atmosphere of America and proceed to build "more stately mansions for the American soul."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution be printed in the Record following my remarks, and appropriately referred.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wisconsin? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 29), submitted by Mr. WILEY, was referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring). That there is hereby established a Joint Committee on the Budget (hereinafter referred to as the "joint committee") to be composed of — members of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and — members of the Committee on Finance of the Senate, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and — members of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and — members of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Vacancies in the membership of the joint committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the joint committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as the original selection. The joint committee shall select a chairman from among its members.

SEC. 2. It shall be the duty of the joint committee to make a full and complete study and analysis of the Budget of the United States, and to make such other studies and investigations concerning governmental revenues and expenditures as it may deem necessary, with a view to assisting the Congress in formulating a comprehensive fiscal program. The joint committee shall report, from time to time, to the committees of the Senate and House of Representatives from which the membership of the joint committee was appointed, and, in its discretion, to the Senate or House of Representatives, or both, the results of its studies and investigations, together with such recommendations as it may deem advisable.

SEC. 3. The joint committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-ninth Congress, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words.

SEC. 4. (a) The joint committee shall have power to employ and fix the compensation of such officers, experts, and employees as it deems necessary in the performance of its duties, but the compensation so fixed shall not exceed the compensation prescribed under the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, for comparable duties. The joint committee

is authorized to request the use of the services, information, facilities, and personnel of the departments and agencies in the executive branch of the Government.

(b) The expenses of the joint committee, which shall not exceed \$— shall be paid out of the contingent funds of the Senate and House of Representatives, one-half to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate and one-half to be disbursed by the Clerk of the House of Representatives.

COMPOSITION OF THE POSTWAR NAVY

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I submit for reference to the Committee on Naval Affairs a concurrent resolution similar to one that is being submitted in the House of Representatives by Representative VINSON, relating to the proposed size of the postwar Navy, and I ask in that connection that a brief statement summarizing the provisions of the concurrent resolution be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the concurrent resolution submitted by the Senator from Massachusetts will be referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs and the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 30), submitted by Mr. WALSH, was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, as follows:

Whereas under the Constitution of the United States the Congress is charged with the responsibility of providing and maintaining a Navy; and

Whereas the wars in which the United States has been engaged are now in the process of being brought to a successful close; and

Whereas it will not be necessary to retain for the Navy all of the ships, vessels, or craft now built, building, or authorized; and

Whereas it is necessary for the Congress to determine the size of the immediate postwar Navy, giving due consideration to the security of the United States and its territories and insular possessions, the protection of our commerce, and the necessity for cooperating with other world powers in the maintenance of peace; and

Whereas such immediate postwar Navy will require an adequate fleet and supporting aircraft, personnel, bases, and establishments: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of Congress that the Navy of the United States should consist of ships of the following types and numbers:

1. Three large aircraft carriers (42,000 tons), 24 aircraft carriers (27,000 tons), 10 light aircraft carriers (11,000 tons), 79 escort aircraft carriers, 18 battleships, 3 large cruisers, 31 heavy cruisers, 48 light cruisers, 367 destroyers, 296 escort destroyers, and 200 submarines.

2. That sufficient aircraft, auxiliary vessels, mine vessels, patrol vessels, landing craft, district craft, and drydocks should be maintained to support the above enumerated fleet.

3. That adequate facilities to support the Navy should be maintained wherever necessary.

4. That sufficient personnel should be provided to adequately maintain and operate the Navy and that proper and adequate facilities be provided and maintained to fully train such personnel.

5. That ships, vessels, and craft enumerated above should be replaced unit for unit in accordance with existing law, or earlier if the development of weapons or scientific research make such ship, vessel, or craft obsolete or obsolescent.

6. That an orderly shipbuilding and aircraft replacement program should be maintained.

7. That a progressive program of research and development in all fields of naval warfare be carried on and that an adequate organization and facilities for that purpose be maintained.

The statement presented by Mr. WALSH is as follows:

Mr. President, I am submitting today, in conjunction with a similar resolution which is being submitted in the House of Representatives by the Honorable CARL VINSON, chairman of the House Naval Affairs Committee, a concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress with respect to the postwar Navy. The resolution, in brief, states it is the sense of Congress that the Navy of the United States should consist of ships of the following types:

1. Three large aircraft carriers (42,000 tons), 24 aircraft carriers (27,000 tons), 10 light aircraft carriers (11,000 tons), 79 escort aircraft carriers, 18 battleships, 3 large cruisers, 31 heavy cruisers, 48 light cruisers, 367 destroyers, 296 escort destroyers, 200 submarines.

2. That sufficient aircraft, auxiliary vessels, mine vessels, patrol vessels, landing craft, district craft, and drydocks should be maintained to support the above-enumerated fleet.

3. That adequate facilities to support the Navy should be maintained wherever necessary.

4. That sufficient personnel should be provided to adequately maintain and operate the Navy and that proper and adequate facilities be provided and maintained to fully train such personnel.

5. That ships, vessels, and craft enumerated above should be replaced unit for unit in accordance with existing law, or earlier if the development of weapons, or scientific research make such ship, vessel, or craft obsolete or obsolescent.

6. That an orderly shipbuilding and aircraft replacement program should be maintained.

7. That a progressive program of research and development in all fields of naval warfare be carried on and that an adequate organization and facilities for that purpose be maintained. For the information of the Members of the Senate, I annex a table which sets forth a comparison of the number of vessels in the postwar Navy, the present Navy, and the prewar Navy.

Type vessel	Proposed in postwar Navy	Present Navy (available, building, and authorized)	Total authorized up to and including the Naval Expansion Act approved May 17, 1938
Large aircraft carriers (42,000 tons)	3	3	8
Aircraft carriers (27,000 tons)	24	27	
Light aircraft carriers (11,000 tons)	10	10	
Escort aircraft carriers	79	79	
Battleships	18	24	18
Large cruisers	3	3	18
Heavy cruisers	31	33	
Light cruisers	48	57	28
Destroyers	367	450	144
Destroyer escorts	296	359	56
Submarines	200	263	
Total	1,079	1,308	272

Mr. President, if the resolution be adopted, it will serve as a guide to Congress and to the Navy Department in future planning for the Navy and will serve as notice to the world that the United States does not intend

to junk her mighty fleet, but intends, rather, to keep herself strong and invincible.

The 1,079 ships of the combat types as enumerated in the resolution compare with a total of 1,308, which is the aggregate number of ships of these categories presently available or under construction or authorized. In a word, our postwar Navy, if we adopt the 1,079 figure and maintain our fleet at that limit, will be not far below its present strength as respects combat ships. It will be approximately four times the size of the fleet that was authorized in the Naval Expansion Act of 1938, enacted in May of that year, and which put the total authorized strength of the Navy at 272 combat ships.

It is important to note, however, that with respect to this proposed total postwar fleet of 1,079 combat ships it is contemplated that one-third to be kept fully manned and ready for any emergency; one-third be organized into reserve fleets and partially manned; the remainder be held in decommissioned status but available for recommissioning if needed.

I may say that in general the foregoing enumeration accords with the views of the officials of the Navy Department with respect to the size and characteristics of the Navy that will be required in the postwar era to fully meet the obligations of the United States.

RESUMPTION OF HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION UNDER THE FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY ACT OF 1944

Mr. McKELLAR submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 31), which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That for the purposes only as specified in section 2 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 (Public Law 521, 78th Cong.), it is hereby found as a fact that the war emergency has been relieved to an extent that will justify proceeding with the highway-construction program provided for by said act, and for the purposes of said act the first postwar fiscal year referred to therein shall be the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946.

EXTENSION OF FURLOUGHS WITH PAY TO CERTAIN MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President, I submit for appropriate reference a concurrent resolution granting extended furloughs to members of the armed forces who are awaiting further assignment or discharge from the service.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 32), submitted by Mr. Buck, was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the granting of extended furloughs with full pay and allowances to members of the armed forces who are awaiting further assignment or discharge from the service, or whose services can be spared from their present assignments, would be helpful to such members in preparing for their re-employment in civilian life or for the resumption of educational pursuits; and that the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, respectively, should take steps to initiate and place into effect such a system of extended furloughs at the earliest practicable date.

INVESTIGATION OF CERTAIN ECONOMIC QUESTIONS RESULTING FROM TERMINATION OF THE WAR

Mr. DOWNEY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 172), which was referred to the Committee on Civil Service:

Resolved, That a special committee composed of five Senators to be appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate is authorized to make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to the effects upon the civilian economy in the Pacific Coast and Rocky Mountain States of (a) unemployment resulting from the discharge of civilian employees of the United States and persons employed in war activities, (b) shifts in population resulting from the migration of persons employed in war activities and the separation from the armed forces of persons stationed in such areas; (c) disposition of surplus Government-owned property; and (d) other problems arising as a result of the termination of the war and the reconversion to a peacetime economy. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations as it may deem desirable.

For the purpose of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate in the Seventy-ninth Congress, as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this resolution. The committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to invite the heads of interested governmental agencies to assign representatives of their respective agencies to accompany the members of the committee, or duly authorized subcommittee thereof, to such places as may be necessary for the purpose of participating in such investigation and in hearings held in connection therewith. The expenses of the committee or subcommittee under this resolution shall not be paid out of or create a charge upon the contingent fund of the Senate.

ESTABLISHMENT OF ARMY SEPARATION CENTERS IN THE VARIOUS STATES

Mr. MAYBANK submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 173), which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

Resolved, That in order to provide for the speedy return to civilian life of persons to be discharged from the Army, the Secretary of War is requested to establish a separation center in each State, wherever practicable.

REMOVAL OF DAIRY PRODUCTS FROM RATION LIST

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the Federal Government is refusing to buy set-aside butter in the hands of receivers and is consequently risking the causing of a price slump for the Nation's dairymen. This adds one more impelling factor why butter and other dairy products should be removed from rationing immediately. On too many occasions already has the failure to quickly remove obsolete wartime controls, such as in the case of slaughtering, caused havoc among producers and extreme annoyance to consumers. Dairying must not be the victim of more bureaucratic bungling.

I have already written to Secretary of Agriculture Anderson as follows:

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: May I respectfully submit that with the Nation now well into the reconversion period the time has come and is, indeed, long overdue for all dairy products, including butter and cheese, to be taken off the ration list.

Although the supply of these products may not be sufficient at present to give every would-be purchaser the entire supply that he would like, surely our dealers could informally apportion the limited supplies to prevent hogging.

Removing these items from rationing would not only rid the public of one more annoyance but would also help the dairy industry, whose well-being is so vital to the Nation, to readjust itself to normal conditions.

Looking forward to your early reply as to the Department's intentions in this regard, I am,

Sincerely yours,

ALEXANDER WILEY.

NATIONAL MONUMENT TO COMMEMORATE FIRST ATOM BOMB TEST

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, a news item which appeared in the Washington Star of yesterday, September 9, is of much interest, I am sure, to the people of the United States, if not of all the world, and especially to the people of my own State, New Mexico. The article reads:

NATIONAL MONUMENT CONSIDERED ON SITE OF FIRST ATOM BOMB TEST

A national monument may mark the spot in New Mexico where the first atomic bomb experiment was conducted.

Secretary of the Interior Ickes yesterday announced he has instructed Fred W. Johnson, Commissioner of the General Land Office, to reserve such land on the Alamogordo bombing range as would be needed to establish the monument.

Mr. Ickes' action followed a suggestion by Joseph H. Stratton, 2304 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, a Department attorney, that the site of the explosion be perpetuated as a milestone in national progress.

For his idea Mr. Stratton was recommended for a \$100 cash award under the Department's employee suggestion program.

Mr. Ickes also instructed the National Park Service to make a survey of the site as soon as the Army permits, on the basis of which the Secretary will recommend establishment of the monument to President Truman.

"The harnessing of the basic power of the universe through the atomic bomb ushers in man's understanding of nature's forces and presages the use of atomic power not only as a forceful influence toward the maintenance of world peace but also as an instrument, through use in peace, for the creation of a better standard of living throughout the world," Secretary Ickes said.

Mr. Stratton was awarded \$100 in cash for that suggestion.

Mr. President, in that connection I wish to add that the people of New Mexico have also had this idea in mind. On the 11th day of August the Alamogordo Chamber of Commerce directed a letter to the United States Park Service making the suggestion that this site be set aside as a national monument, and by coincidence, I received a long letter dated the 15th of August from Mr. Charles S. McCollum of Las Cruces, N. Mex., making the identical suggestion, with several pertinent observations. One of them is this:

In setting aside this area as a national monument, an international monument in fact, my idea is to make this site a real peace monument or shrine for the entire world.

I may add, Mr. President, that both letters were promptly transmitted to the appropriate department.

I received a letter dated September 6, 1945, from Hilory A. Tolson, Acting Director of the National Park Service, in reply to the letters from the citizens of New Mexico.

I ask that the three letters be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALAMOGORDO CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,

August 11, 1945.

The DIRECTOR OF UNITED STATES PARK SERVICE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The explosion of the atomic bomb is a great historical and world-shaking event. The fields of the Alamogordo Air Field at which place this first explosion occurred will always be of historical interest. This spot of earth, being as renowned as it already is and will be much more so in the years to come, we feel should have worthy recognition. People will want to see the spot where this great event occurred bringing in a new era the same as they have wanted to see the spot where the first Pilgrim set foot on this continent. It is also our opinion that no department of the United States Government could do justice to this as well as your own department of National Park Service. The recognition your National Park Service has given other places of great historical interest has proved of great value. Therefore, we, the Chamber of Commerce of Alamogordo, N. Mex., do petition your department to declare the atomic-bomb proving ground a national monument or historic site.

Due to the fact this spot is within the confines of the vast Alamogordo bombing range we realize it can only be a postwar project but we believe that your department should now officially mark and secure the place for future use.

We trust you will give this request your most favorable attention and we will be glad to give any assistance we can at any time. This organization is most anxious to do its part in any way to have this place marked as a place of interest for the years to come.

Sincerely yours,

A. P. GRIDER,

President.

Fritz Heilbronn,

Secretary.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATION,
Las Cruces, N. Mex., August 16, 1945.

Hon. CARL A. HATCH,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HATCH: I have had an idea in mind for several days that I believe will not only prove worthy of your interest, and to the interest of all residents of New Mexico, but to all the inhabitants of our glorious United States of America as well, and I am submitting it to you for your consideration and, I hope, approval.

In brief the idea is to present a bill, or resolution, for the approval of the Congress, to set aside the area in which the first atomic bomb was set off as a national monument, which would also be something in the way of a shrine or memorial to the scientists who developed and made possible the atomic bomb and to those who have sacrificed their lives in the interest of the greatest peace ever known to mankind.

I understand that a rather sizable crater resulted from the explosion, or whatever happened when the bomb was set off, and it is the preservation of this crater that I have in mind—a stark witness to the terrific force that was harnessed in the interest of bringing the terrible war to a more speedy conclusion than would otherwise have been possible. I think it has been stated that the Japanese have admitted that it was useless to continue the war because of the atomic bomb, which means that a tremendous loss of American lives was prevented by the use of the bomb instead of making an invasion of Japan.

In setting aside this area as a national monument, an international monument in fact, my idea is to make this site a real peace

monument or shrine for the entire world. The crater should be left as it is for those who are alive to see, and for all posterity to view as an evidence of the terrible force that can be utilized against any nation that might have thoughts of making war on any other country. The crater should be fenced with appropriate fencing that would endure for years to come, and a suitable building, or buildings, and I do not mean anything on a small scale, should be constructed that would be worthy of comparison with many of the fine buildings in Washington.

An area of sufficient size, to give proper setting to the building, should be set aside surrounding the crater and this area should be made into a park that would do credit to the peace idea involved. I know that this crater is in desert country, but you and I know full well that our deserts can be made to bloom if given water. Wells could be sunk for this purpose. My idea is that the building should be such that any individual visiting the scene could feel the surrounding peacefulness of the desert calm. In other words, view the crater with thoughts of the destructiveness of war and its attendant devastation and then, within the building calmly let one's thoughts dwell upon the constructive forces that can be utilized for peace and good will toward all.

Considering what this shrine would mean to the entire world I believe it would be worthy of a permanent Army and Navy guard of honor. If there is such a thing as a formula for the bomb, and I feel sure there is, then it could be separated into several parts and, together with other vital information, sealed in vaults underneath the building with the keys or combinations of these vaults left with out Treasury or State Department. A scroll would be set up in the building listing the names of the scientists who gave their time and ideas to the development of the bomb. A gallery could be set up in the building in which numerous pictures would show some of the horrors of war, of this last and greatest and most destructive of all wars. Another gallery could be set up in which pictures and murals would depict the more peaceful scenes of life in this country. Flags and plaques from all the United Nations would form a part of the decorations within the building.

Of course, in thinking of this, being a true New Mexican, even if only by adoption, I can't help but let a bit of the commercial side of the project enter my thoughts, though these thoughts are truly secondary to the main idea. I think you will agree with me that the project could be looked upon as a worthy postwar work and I don't believe money could be expended for a more worthy one. Also, as the average American citizen has rather a large bump of curiosity, I firmly believe this shrine would be a Mecca for many, many tourists and visitors to our state, not only to see what the atomic bomb had accomplished but to be able to say that they had been to this shrine.

Such information, superficial, of course, that might be possible to be given to the public, such as the length of time that it took to perfect the bomb, number of people employed, costs, etc., could be set up in plaque form within the building and the comparative size of the bomb, that was set off in New Mexico, with relation to the ones that were dropped on Japan, in order for anyone to be able to grasp what could be done to any nation that had warlike intentions in the future. I truly believe that visits would be made by many of the "higher ups" in other lands in order to view at first hand the destruction that can be caused by the bomb and I haven't the least doubt that all such would pause and reflect on the consequences in the event their nations had any ideas of a warlike nature. I don't believe any would leave the scene in a warlike mood.

If, after reading my rather lengthy letter,

the idea appeals to you, I think the first step would be to have the Congress make an appropriation for the drawing up and development of suitable plans, to be followed by an appropriation for the bringing into being a fine and lasting monument of peace for the entire world. If my efforts in this respect meet with your approval, I will be glad to give, voluntarily, any time that would be necessary on my part to the development of the plan, the basic ideas of which I have in mind.

You may recall the writer as one who, while with the Farm Security Administration as district supervisor for the east side of New Mexico, had his headquarters in Clovis before you moved your office from there, and who called on you several times in the interests of New Mexico, as related to the FSA, before he moved to the regional office in Amarillo to take up administrative work in connection with standardization of the work in the field offices in region XII.

Please accept my kindest regards in behalf of yourself and also in behalf of your capable secretary whom I had the pleasure of conversing with when I was in Washington some 3 years ago this coming November while on my way to see my boy who was in training at Athens, Ga., as a Navy aviator. I regret to add that he gave his life for his country. I am proud to state that I also have a daughter, a lieutenant junior grade, Navy nurse, who has served in all theaters of operation and whom I expect to land in the U. S. A. within the next few days from the Philippines, and another son who is an ensign and who is now in the vicinity of Japan on an LST.

Most sincerely yours,

CHARLES S. MCCOLLUM.

P. S.—As I have been informed that you may be in New Mexico for a few days more before returning to Washington I am mailing this to Clovis.

C. S. McC.

UNITED STATES.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE,

Chicago, Ill., September 6, 1945.

HON. CARL A. HATCH,

United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR HATCH: We have received your letter of August 25, with enclosures from Messrs. A. P. Grider and Fritz Heilbronn of the Alamogordo Chamber of Commerce, and from Mr. Charles S. McCollum of the Farm Security Administration, Las Cruces, N. Mex., suggesting the establishment of a national monument at the site where the atomic bomb was first tested.

The Department has requested that an immediate investigation and report be made of this area. However, our Region Three Office in Santa Fe, N. Mex., has advised us that, for security reasons, the Army will not grant permission for investigation of this site at this time. These tests are understood to have been conducted on the Alamogordo Bombing Range, an active Army bombing range located in southern New Mexico. We assume that these security restrictions may be lifted reasonably soon.

The epoch-making significance of this scientific discovery has aroused the Nation. Certainly the site of the final experiment of work on the atomic bomb is of national and international interest. Your letter with enclosures is being referred to the Department.

Sincerely yours,

HILLORY A. TOLSON,
Acting Director.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I merely wish to add my own approval of the thought and idea that this spot where the first atomic bomb was exploded be set aside and marked as a national monument, not to the destructive forces of atomic energy, but that it may be a

monument to its peace-giving qualities and really, as Mr. McCollum said, a shrine for peace throughout the entire world.

THE FULL-EMPLOYMENT BILL—EDITORIAL COMMENT

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, since the beginning of the recent hearings before the Banking and Currency Committee on the full-employment bill, S. 380, this significant legislation has been discussed, pro and con, in the editorial columns of scores of newspapers throughout the country.

One of the most interesting editorials that has been called to my attention is one entitled "Seeing Things Under the Bed," which appeared in the Chicago Times on August 25, 1945.

The criticisms of the Murray full-employment bill—

States the Chicago Times—

are following the familiar pattern of protests that were spewed forth when social security and unemployment compensation and other such measures were proposed during the thirties. . . . We think the againers are seeing things under the bed, just as they had nightmares during the thirties.

The editorial then proceeds to point out that—

The bill does not put the Government in competition with business; it does not authorize operation of plants and factories by the Government; it does not guarantee specific jobs to specific workers; it does not authorize compulsory assignment of workers to jobs; it does not provide Government guarantees of individual markets or profits; it does not authorize Government determination of prices or wages; it does not authorize disclosure of trade secrets.

The editorial also states in summation what the full employment bill does do. Let me quote again:

In a nutshell, the plan does set up a system by which we can find out in advance of crises how we stand on jobs. It emphasizes foresight and prevention, to minimize emergency action. It puts our national economy on a "business basis." It emphasizes cooperation with industry, agriculture, labor, and local governments. That's the formula we used to win the war. The Murray bill is an experiment in national teamwork, just as surely as the efforts of the scientists who developed the atom bomb.

Mr. President, in view of the intense interest in this important legislation, I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the RECORD at this point, in connection with my remarks, a set of editorials on the full-employment bill from leading newspapers throughout the United States, including the Chicago Times' editorial to which I have just referred.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Sun of August 1, 1945]

ECHOES FROM ABROAD AND THE JOBS BILL

It was fitting that the initial hearings on the Wagner-Murray full-employment bill should be held this week while the echoes of the British election still reverberated in Washington.

Britain's Labor Government is preparing to carry out the people's mandate for a far-reaching social program aimed at jobs and

security for all. Our Government has yet to decide whether a vigorous attempt shall be made to secure the same objectives by strong and positive social planning for an economy based on private initiative.

The decision, to a large extent, rests with the American counterparts of those British Tories whose inflexible hostility to change led them down the pike to political disaster. Such men as Senators TAFT, VANDENBERG, GEORGE, and McKELLAR could assure speedy passage of the full employment bill with bipartisan support if they determined to read wisely the lesson of the British election. Can they read that lesson? Can they read the lesson of our own past?

The lineal ancestor of the Wagner-Murray bill was the Employment Stabilization Act of 1931, and it is instructive to recall the history of that measure, originally introduced by Senator WAGNER in 1928. The act provided for the advance planning of public works as a means of stabilizing fluctuations in private employment. It was an act to plan in good times against the onset of bad times.

Widespread bipartisan support backed the measure. Herbert Hoover several times endorsed its principles and, as President, signed the bill. Senator VANDENBERG and Senator George Wharton Pepper, of Pennsylvania, were among its Republican advocates.

By the time Congress got around to passing the bill, however, the country was no longer riding the crest of a boom. The depression which this bill with others was meant to forestall had become a grim fact. Advance planning had to give way to emergency action on an unprecedented scale. The Employment Stabilization Board established by the act was swept into the background, its functions being absorbed first by the PWA and later by the National Resources Planning Board.

In the end the latter agency was done to death by a reactionary coalition in Congress, anxious to vent its spleen against the New Deal. Today, as we confront the towering problems of demobilization, the need for national economic planning has become more pressing than ever, and the Wagner-Murray bill is the response to that need. The wheel has come full circle.

Events since 1931 have made it evident that public works planning alone cannot stabilize the whole economy. Therefore the Wagner-Murray bill, much broader than its predecessor, provides for the presentation by the President each year of an "employment budget," estimating the number of jobs likely to be available in private industry. If a substantial volume of unemployment is indicated, then the President and Congress would consider (without commitment to enact) a whole series of measures designed first to stimulate private employment and, second, if necessary, to supplement it.

Thus the bill sets up in advance machinery for dealing with economic fluctuations. The machinery might not be wisely used. If used, it might fail. But that it should at least be set up—that the Nation should at least make the effort to mobilize its resources of economic knowledge for the general welfare—is as obvious as the need for a world peace organization to check military aggression.

[From the Raleigh (N. C.) News and Observer of August 29, 1945]

FULL EMPLOYMENT BILL

There should be no politics in the full employment bill that is first on the agenda when Congress assembles. In the campaign last year President Roosevelt and Governor Dewey, speaking for the two great parties, promised jobs for all when war ended. President Truman, Secretary of State Byrnes, Secretary of Commerce Wallace, and nearly all responsible leaders are urging prompt action

on the sacred promise made to the voters, particularly to those who have served in the armed forces or who have been engaged in making war munitions and war supplies.

It is a measure so humanitarian—not political—that church leaders are uniting with forward-looking businessmen, labor leaders, and public officials in calling for its enactment. We could lend-lease over \$40,000,000,000 for war. We must not fail to do all that is necessary in peace. Bishop Oxnorn, president of the Federal Council of Churches in America, spoke a parable when he said: "An economic order that cannot provide opportunity for all to work cannot endure."

Testifying before the Senate committee, Bishop Oxnorn said:

"This bill, when it becomes law, will take its place in history among the significant legislative acts of our time. It is supported throughout the Nation by church people everywhere.

"Failure to use the full productive power of the Nation is to sabotage the future. It is real labor applied to real material on real machines that means real wealth. To fail to use such labor is to make the future poorer in a material sense, and when we consider what happens to the mind and heart of the unemployed man, it is to make the future poorer likewise in a spiritual sense.

"To many men who objected quite properly to the killing of little pigs were silent in the presence of mass unemployment in which a man's self-respect is killed and as a result of which we failed to produce necessary goods which, as far as true wealth is concerned, has precisely the same effect as the destruction of goods.

"It is not to lose our freedom to use our heads to solve the problems that must be solved if freedom is to endure. There are some who insist that to plan is to enslave. That to me is nonsense.

"But its framers realize that freedom to engage in free competitive enterprise is, in the long run, dependent upon another aspect of freedom, namely, the right of the individual worker to a job. A man who cannot get a job is not free. * * *

"Nothing is more menacing to the public than mass unemployment. This bill is not only an expression of sound ethical ideals, of common sense and of justice, but is fundamental to the preservation of the Republic itself."

[From the Los Angeles (Calif.) News of August 13, 1945]

CONGRESS SHOULD ACT NOW

We are pitifully unprepared for an abrupt and unexpected end of the war.

Congress is on vacation. Moreover, the Senate Banking Subcommittee, which is handling the full-employment bill, has recessed until October 9.

The danger of legislative inaction cannot be minimized.

Delays breed dangers in peace as well as in war. Failure of Congress to stay on the job—while the fighting and home fronts have continued the victory drive without respite—is a sad commentary on political responsibility in this critical hour. America deserves better from her elected representatives.

Reconversion, full employment, war-contracts termination—even adjusted-unemployment compensation—are yet principally in the talking stage. We aren't ready to make an orderly transition from war economy to peace economy. And we shall not be ready in the Nation until Congress acts, nor in California until the legislature redeems the failures of the recently concluded fifty-sixth session.

The trouble is that the typical American politician is subject to a great fear. Oftentimes, as J. F. Salter has pointed out, "the politician does not do what he wants to do, but does what he must do, or thinks he must do, in order to keep power."

Inability to judge correctly the probable reaction of the electorate to reconversion legislation is Congress' greatest handicap.

But even in their present short recess, Representatives and Senators must thus far certainly have had demonstrated to them the deep and urgent public sentiment for legislative bridge building into the postwar future.

The full employment bill is the first—and perhaps most important—of several proposals designed to cope with the economic crisis ahead.

Under this bill, the President would send to Congress each year a production and employment budget, together with recommendations for whatever legislation might be necessary to assure full employment for the subsequent year.

The full employment bill has not been hatched out of empty theory. It stems from a great study of the American economic system made by the temporary National Economic Committee, under the chairmanship of Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, Democrat, of Wyoming.

In its essence, the jobs measure aims to meet the problem of employment by attacking the problem of spending. Full production is made by full spending—either by individuals or Government. Unless someone spends, goods are not bought, production declines, and unemployment results.

It is important to understand, however, that the full-employment measure is not based upon deficit spending by the Government except as a last resort.

Charges, therefore, that it is "collectivist" and "totalitarian" are without foundation. What the bill proposes to do is to stimulate private spending (when necessary, through legislation relating to taxes, monopolies, banking policies) wages and working conditions, foreign trade, social security, and the development of natural resources.

In the event these measures should fail to increase private spending sufficiently, the President would then propose governmental spending or lending to make up the balance.

Basically full-employment legislation is designed to build a stronger floor under free enterprise—to save free economy from its own heretofore planless existence. As O'MAHONEY has said, "Unless our free Government undertakes to plan a free economy, we are in great danger of losing that free government."

Therefore, planning now—not at some unspecified date after VJ-day—but now, while there is time to avert economic dislocation, is an imperative.

Government economists are predicting that at least 6,000,000 and possibly 12,000,000 Americans will be out of work within a few months after Japan capitulates.

The larger figure of 12,000,000 is considered a conservative estimate should victory come before the end of the present year.

An unemployment tide of such vast proportions could well provide a sinister force. Aside from unemployment-insurance payments, there would be no way of coping with it, under present conditions, within a period of many months.

Perhaps, incredible as it seems, there are people who want unemployment—who mistakenly believe that doles are cheaper than jobs—who delude themselves into fancying profit advantages in a huge pile of idle—and, therefore, low-wage—labor.

But common sense dictates an opposite and almost unthinkable conclusion. Widespread unemployment in the United States would spell not only national but international disaster.

"Mass unemployment," says Senator ROBERT F. WAGNER, Democrat, of New York, co-sponsor of the jobs bill, "would drive us toward both economic isolationism and economic imperialism."

"Under such circumstances," he points out, "the splendid edifice of the United Nations

Charter we are now building * * * would be like a factory building without a dynamo."

Congress alone can supply the dynamo. But Congress is on vacation.

American—and world—security cannot wait while Congressmen go fishing.

[From the Scranton (Pa.) Tribune of August 14, 1945]

A FUTURE WITH A JOB

Government's responsibility for full employment, the thesis of the new Murray full employment bill, is officially embraced by several countries. The Labor Party in Britain stands for this objective as does the Australian Government. In Sweden the subject has been receiving active consideration for several years. In Russia the right to work is a constitutional right.

Under the pressure of war demands, American industry has enormously increased its production, not only of direct war materials, but of almost all kinds of civilian-type products. Many persons predict that the American people, after this convincing demonstration of the Nation's productive capacity, will not tolerate any protracted period of mass unemployment after the war. The feeling is that, when the industrial machine is so obviously able to satisfy everyone's material wants, the people will insist that means be found to assure full employment and sustain the purchasing power that will make it possible to utilize total plant capacity and raise the general standard of living.

The opinion that the Government must assume responsibility for providing adequate job opportunities is not confined to those who have popularized the 60,000,000 jobs slogan, nor to the sponsors and supporters of the Murray bill. Governor Dewey, in his capacity of Republican Presidential nominee, said at Seattle, September 18, 1944: "We must have full employment. * * * Those who have come home from the war and those who have produced for the war—all our people—have earned a future with jobs for all." Three days later Dewey was more specific. He observed that the question of job opportunities was everybody's business and therefore the business of the Government.

[From the Nashville (Tenn.) Tennessean of August 27, 1945]

TO EACH: A JOB

Among the most misunderstood and misrepresented measures which have been submitted to Congress in many years is the Murray-Wagner full employment bill.

It is frequently stated that the bill assumes that private enterprise cannot supply jobs for the American people. The bill makes no such assumption as this. It is also asserted that the bill rests on the premise that machine-age mass production has exhausted the frontiers on which a private expanding economy could be built. No such premise is held by the proponents of the measure. The bill does not even require government spending to take up an employment slack, as it is often declared.

The bill assumes that private business can enormously expand its production to provide jobs and supply demand, but will do so when general planning and accepted goals of production make such an expansion profitable.

The full employment bill does not obligate the Government to enter the field of employment directly or indirectly through public works to take up the slack of unemployment should it develop. It does assess the Government with responsibility to take whatever action seems advisable to alleviate conditions. Necessary public works is a desirable reserve against the threat of unemployment. But the Government is free to stimulate private employment through fiscal or tax policies or even to do nothing.

The Murray-Wagner bill does propose to do what the existing free enterprise system cannot do for itself that will enable it to produce bountifully without being threatened with the risk of a paralyzing deflation. A national budget of investment, expenditure, jobs, stock on hand, and consumer needs and demands—revised quarterly—together with elastic fiscal and tax policies, international trade policies, and a reserve of public works cannot but have a beneficent influence on the national income.

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Times of August 25, 1945]

SEEING THINGS UNDER THE BED

The criticisms of the Murray full employment bill are following the familiar pattern of protests that were spewed forth when social security and unemployment compensation and other such measures were proposed during the 1930's.

The againers have dragged out the old slogan: The full employment bill would bring about a Government-managed national economy, throttle private production, and discourage private investment.

We think the againers are seeing things under the bed, just as they had nightmares during the 1930's. Actually the bill does little more than set up Government policy asserting the right of Americans to have employment if they are able to work and want to work. It establishes machinery to achieve cooperation among business, labor, agriculture, State and local governments, and the Federal Government.

In the last election campaign Governor Dewey, the Republican candidate for President, said: "If at any time there are not sufficient jobs in private employment to go around, then government can and must create additional job opportunities. There must be jobs for all." Beardsley Ruml, chairman of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, has said, "The basic ideas of the Murray bill have had bipartisan sponsorship and deserve nonpartisan standing."

Businessmen would do well to study what the full employment bill does not do.

The bill does not put the Government in competition with business. It does not authorize operation of plants and factories by the Government. It does not guarantee specific jobs to specific workers. It does not authorize compulsory assignment of workers to jobs. It does not provide Government guarantees of individual markets or profits. It does not authorize Government determination of prices or wages. It does not authorize disclosures of trade secrets.

In a nutshell, the plan does set up a system by which we can find out in advance of crisis how we stand on jobs. It emphasizes foresight and prevention, to minimize emergency action. It puts our national economy on a business basis. It emphasizes cooperation with industry, agriculture, labor, and local governments. That's the formula we used to win the war. The Murray bill is an experiment in national teamwork, just as surely as the efforts of the scientists who developed the atom bomb.

[From the Louisville (Ky.) Courier-Journal of August 28, 1945]

JOBS FOR ALL—TODAY AND TOMORROW

There are signs that the so-called full-employment bill requires protection not only from its opponents but also from some of its supporters, and that the best way to provide this protection lies, in both cases, in a proper and unremitting interpretation of its aims.

Simply, the legislation has been devised as an instrument for enduring economic stability and it is not an emergency measure. It is neither vague and unrealistic as it has been described by an Alabama Congressman [CARTER MANASCO], (who seems to be keynoting the arguments against it to be expected from champions of free enterprise, meaning

unregulated enterprise) nor is it a plan that can be applied at once to the condition now developing from hour to hour as war contracts are cancelled and workers set adrift. When its friends undertake to hold it up as a means of solving immediate problems, they promise too much and may be doing more harm than good to its genuine and valuable objectives.

At risk of tiring the reader by repetition, it ought to be recalled that the bill provides for the President—any President, not just Mr. Truman—to transmit to Congress at the beginning of each regular session a national production and employment budget; in other words, a budget of jobs that will be provided and people who will need jobs.

If it is found, from as nearly complete and scientific a survey as possible, that private investment and expenditure will be insufficient to employ the estimated labor force, the President is to supply a program of added incentive to private enterprise—adapted banking and currency policies, monopoly controls, tax adjustment, foreign trade, etc.

If there still remains a deficiency (more job seekers than jobs), then the bill provides that the President shall submit to Congress "a general program for such Federal investment and expenditure as will be sufficient to bring the aggregate volume of investment and expenditure by private business, consumers, State and local government and the Federal Government up to the level required to assure a full employment volume of production." Thus, public works may be seen as the last resort.

What, one may ask, is vague and unrealistic about all this? It looks from here like the most realistic proposal ever broached to a capitalistic Nation (resolved to remain capitalistic), if not the only one, by which to level off the peaks and valleys of boom and bust that have marked our economic map with a regularity like the pulse of fate since 1790.

The thing it will not do, however, is to change the economic picture and provide jobs for millions overnight, and one who expects it to do so is likely to be disillusioned and driven perhaps into a reaction of every man for himself, which is the same old thing, the devil taking the hindmost. To be sure, its passage and the prospects of dependability which this will create, is likely to have at once a salutary moral effect, but the direct application will be a matter of fiscal-year planning. Even if it be immediately adopted, the law could not go into effective operation before July 1, 1946, if then.

The point to bear in mind, lest partisan politics and lack of courage to approach new formulas for salvation undo all our hope, is the point made by Harry W. Schacter, of Louisville, in his testimony supporting the bill before the Senate Banking Committee last week:

"Some 10 years ago we in America, mindful of the welfare of all our people, embarked on a program of social security. If we pass this bill, we will be embarking on a program of economic security. It is unthinkable that we could or would give up our social-security program today. In fact, we propose to expand it. I venture the prediction that if we pass this bill, it will be just as unthinkable 10 years from today that we would give up this program for economic security."

It is not enough, then, to say that because the proposal may not be applied this month, or this year, it should not concern us now or it is unrealistic. At the same time, it is not enough to say that we must depend on it entirely. What of today and today's needs? A very practical answer to this question, suggesting immediate techniques, came yesterday from the Committee on Economic Development, a "private, nonprofit, nonpolitical association of businessmen," which emphasized the necessity of these things as the first consideration:

Rapid demobilization of armed forces and strengthened aid and protection to veterans in obtaining civilian jobs; liberalization of unemployment compensation benefits; stronger general assistance (direct aid) programs; "properly supervised and limited" grants to transport workers from surplus labor areas to good employment areas; strengthened public employment services; rapid blueprinting of a "reserve shelf" of public works by States and communities (harken, Louisville!); provisions for retraining workers for new jobs, and recommendation to individual employers to "move promptly to put their reemployment plans into effect, timing their actions to provide maximum employment in the early months of peace."

There is a difference, then, between reemployment programs and the full employment bill. The two are complements, one of the other, and do not conflict. It is a time for action; but, as well, a time for keeping our heads.

[From the New York PM of August 27, 1945]
BUSINESS AND EMPLOYMENT

Events of the past few days have demonstrated that many of the returning Republican and southern Democratic Congressmen who are supposed to be spokesmen in Washington for the people are still the spokesmen for that element of business which has learned nothing from a decade of depression and war.

These Republican and southern Democrats have shown that they aren't even as close to the people's viewpoint as many of the more intelligent businessmen of the country. They blindly follow the line of the National Association of Manufacturers in its:

Blindness to the simple fact that business can expand safely and prosper only if it can be sure of selling its products.

Blind hatred for Government leadership even in matters too big and too vital to all of us to be left to any smaller group.

These Republicans and southern Democrats can't even be as liberal as the middle of the road businessmen in the Committee for Economic Development.

This has been demonstrated by a series of happenings since Congress began to reassemble a week ago:

By the refusal of Republicans on the Senate Banking Committee, except for Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY (Republican, New Hampshire), to come out for the full employment bill which has won the support of many businessmen including such noted figures of Beardsley Ruml, Ralph Flanders, and James P. Warburg.

By the silly statement of Senator KENNETH S. WHERRY (Republican, Nebraska), that Government control of the atomic bomb would be socialism, even though it was the Government that developed the bomb. Many businessmen already have conceded that the atomic bomb must be controlled by the Government. WHERRY's logic would compel the Government to get out of such socialistic enterprises as the postal service.

By the demand of Senator HARRY BYRD (Democrat, Virginia) for a balanced Budget soon—a demand which many businessmen including those on the CED are willing to forget until the Nation gets out of its economic difficulties. BYRD calling at this time for a balanced Budget was a perfect reincarnation of Nero fiddling while Rome burned.

If our system of public education was half what it's cracked up to be such men would not stay in public life beyond the next election. Unfortunately, they will.

The attitude of the Republicans on the Senate Banking Committee toward the full employment bill is typical of their approach toward most modern economic problems. They don't like the proposal to pledge the Government to "assure" full employment—

they would prefer a promise to "promote" or "encourage" that objective.

That Government pledge is the heart of the full-employment bill. It is similar in many respects to the Government's pledge back in the dark days of 1933 to guarantee bank deposits. That guarantee eliminated panic among bank depositors—with the result that the public has shown confidence in the banks, and the Government has not had to dip into the Treasury to fulfill the guarantee.

But suppose that in 1933 the Government had promised only to "promote" or "encourage" the safety of bank deposits? How many billions of dollars do you suppose it would have had to put up by this time?

The guarantee in the full-employment bill has the same objective as the guarantee in the bank deposits insurance law. It is designed to use the power of the Government to underwrite purchasing power so that investors and the public can proceed to invest and spend without fear that sudden panic will ruin them.

Without such a guarantee businessmen will hesitate to invest in business—as they hesitated in the depression—and consumers will save their money instead of spending it, inviting a depression that will force the Government to spend and perhaps go down in financial ruin.

With such a guarantee, men with ideas will invest in new businesses and expand old businesses—confident that there will be a market for their products or services. The public will buy instead of hoarding savings for the rainy day ahead when there will be no work available. The Nation will flourish, Government revenue will roll in, and Government expenditures will be held to a minimum. It will be easy for the Government to fulfill its pledge of full employment.

Yet in the face of such obvious reality, Republicans and conservatives in Congress want to make the word in the full-employment bill "encourage" or "promote" instead of "assure" which means guarantee.

NATHAN ROBERTSON.

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Record of August 5, 1945]

THAT "AMERICAN WAY" ALSO INCLUDES INSURANCE

Remember when we were told that the reelection of Roosevelt would mean the end of the American way of life? That was back in 1936.

Now some conservatives rush forward to cry that the full employment bill is going to do to the American way what President Roosevelt did not do—ruin it.

One of our contemporaries insists: "We can provide jobs, real jobs, according to the American way. The burden of proof is on the Murray-Patman bill backers to show that theirs is a better way. The proof hasn't been forthcoming."

This is a typical example of either (a) a Tory attempt to fool the people, or (b) a curious ignorance on the part of the conservatives as to the provisions of the full employment bill.

Our conservative friends have missed the main point:

That so long as private industry provides jobs, the full employment bill will not go into effect.

It will go into effect only when private industry fails to provide enough jobs for the American people.

The Murray-Patman bill is as American as any other form of insurance.

For that is what it is—insurance, against mass unemployment.

Our conservatives insure their businesses, their homes and their lives. They take out insurance protecting them in case of the theft of the family jewels, or the family automobile. Many carry liability insurance not only for employees in their factories, but in case of accident to their domestic help. Not

a few are insured against the hazard of a pedestrian skidding on their sidewalk.

Now, we ask, what is wrong in the Federal Government acting to insure the nation against one of the gravest threats to its stability—mass unemployment?

We repeat: The full employment bill, which would provide public works and various other measures to create work, will take effect only if private industry is unable to keep America employed.

Maybe private industry can do the whole job without any Federal help whatever. We hope so.

But we know that private industry could not keep America's labor force employed during most of the prosperous 1920's. And we know that American business found itself utterly unable to combat the mass unemployment which swept the nation in 1929, winding up in the panic of 1933.

American business tried its level best in those days. Earnestly, sincerely, it strove to halt unemployment, which reached an all-time national high of 13 million.

Government had to step in finally—because private industry simply didn't have the means nor the power to combat an economic disaster so great.

The Murray-Patman bill merely proposes to make plans ahead of time in case that happens again.

It proposes to take out insurance before the hurricane—and not after the hurricane starts to blow.

It proposes to cushion private enterprise, to help private enterprise in the postwar years—by providing it with customers and thus insuring the nation against the fear of another disastrous depression.

Who can truthfully say that such an ounce of prevention is not the American way?

[From the Boston (Mass.) Herald of August 27, 1945]

FULL EMPLOYMENT

A notable feature of the discussion of the full-employment bill is the absence of party politics. Democrats originated the measure and President Truman will ask for immediate passage of it, but various Democrats are opposed to it, and many Republicans are for it. If Dewey had been elected President, the situation would have been similar, perhaps, with Republicans taking the initiative and Democrats giving some assistance to it.

The underlying principle is obviously so unexceptionable that the differences of opinion have to do with ways and means, not with fundamentals. Everybody is so fearful of the far-reaching social, economic, and political effects of protracted mass unemployment that the partisan issues which would have bulked big 5 or 10 years ago have become almost negligible.

The nonpolitical approaches of Republicans and Democrats in and out of Congress are explained in part by the party platforms, the speeches of the candidates, the statements of practically all the governors in 1944—including Leverett Saltonstall—and by State legislation designed to cushion the shock of unemployment. The Democratic platform speaks of full employment in the opening paragraphs. Governor Dewey said in his address of acceptance: "We Republicans are agreed that full employment should be a first objective of the national policy. By full employment I mean a real chance for every man and woman to earn a decent living, at a decent wage." Just as they had identical views of the Axis enemy abroad, the two parties saw the great postwar domestic problem eye to eye.

The moderation and steadiness of President Truman have tended to weaken opposition to a full-employment measure. If President Roosevelt had survived, many Republicans and Democrats would have objected to any such measure, in the belief that it would be administered poorly by officials

who had a zeal for reform, further centralization of authority, and drastic control of private business. These persons have more confidence in Truman and his associates as administrators than they had in President Roosevelt and the other pronounced New Dealers. "Planning" is not such a terrifying term as it was when the New Dealers made the plans.

The pending bill has various provisions to which Republicans will object as Republicans. But the acceptance of the principle involved seems to point to the passing of legislation of some kind to check unemployment before it becomes so ominously large as to threaten another period of depression and ill-advised political innovations.

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Record of July 31, 1945]

A BILL TO KEEP SOCIALISM OUT OF THE UNITED STATES

Senate hearings opened yesterday on a bill to keep socialism out of the U. S. A.

The bill was not titled "A bill to keep socialism out of the United States." It was called "A bill to establish a national program for assuring full employment."

But they mean the same thing.

It is a fact of history that throughout the world men have made up their minds that the right to a job is one of the rights of man. And the same men have decided to obtain that right through their governments.

In Russia the right to a job has been won through communism. In Britain the people have just decided to achieve the same end through socialism. In the United States the people made clear in 1932, again in 1936, and again in 1940, and yet again in 1944, that they wanted to gain the right to a job the "middle way," through the New Deal, without radical extremes. And without hamstringing free enterprise.

The bill up for a Senate hearing this week, the 60,000,000 job bill, is the Government's plan to fulfill its commitment to the people.

This bill is not a new idea. Way back in 1927, Senator George Wharton Pepper, conservative Republican of our own city, introduced a resolution for appointment of a Senate committee to study stabilization of employment and industry through advance planning of public works.

Since then, in one form or another, through PWA, the WPA, the CWA, and other agencies, we have had haphazard, makeshift use of public works to cushion joblessness.

Now this new full-employment bill, of Senators MURRAY and WAGNER and Representative DINGELL, aims to apply the same principles to insuring jobs that the New Deal applied to insuring bank deposits.

The principles of the stitch in time, and the ounce of prevention.

It aims to use the idea advocated by George Wharton Pepper and various others, to plan public works and other job-creating programs before we have a depression, instead of hurriedly resorting to the same ideas after depression is far under way.

It aims to abolish soup kitchens the way we abolished runs on banks.

And the bill specifically provides that the major objective is to help private enterprise maintain employment. The report states:

"Federal expenditures are to be used only as a last-resort measure. Moreover, public works are only one of many possible types of Federal expenditures that might be developed under the full-employment bill. Loans, guarantees, subsidies, purchases are also included"

The main point is that each year the President shall prepare a national production and employment budget, estimating probable private employment, the probable unemployment—and call on Congress for measures to "prevent the deficiency in employment to the greatest possible extent."

The plan is to put on the brakes before the machine gets out of control.

The opposition is getting set.

One big Wall Street bank brands the bill as moving toward totalitarianism and disaster. We shall hear more such claims.

In these objections we find frank opposition to any measures giving the Government responsibility for preventing mass unemployment. The Guaranty Trust Co. of New York calls the very idea dangerous.

Now, not even the Republican Party dared preach that in its 1944 campaign. Yet that party, from 1929 to 1933, proclaimed the policy of letting depressions run their course, and letting self-respecting Americans choose between starvation and standing in line before a relief agency.

The United States of America is not going back to that. Governor Dewey conceded as much in his 1944 campaign. History confirms it.

What is important at the moment is to impress upon our conservatives that they utterly misread the real choice which faces this country today.

It is not a choice between this full-employment bill and going back to days of Hoover and the ideas of McKinley.

The choice we have is whether we preserve free enterprise by trying to assure the right of a job through the full-employment bill, or whether our people are to be driven to the same extreme as the British to gain that objective—socialism.

When will it be realized that this full-employment bill is the most conservative job program proposed for any major power in the world today?

LABOR DAY ADDRESS BY SENATOR THOMAS OF OKLAHOMA

[Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him on Labor Day at Summit Beach Park, Akron, Ohio, as reported in the Summit County Labor News for September 7, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

RECONVERSION—ADDRESS BY SENATOR FERGUSON

[Mr. WHERRY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address on "Reconversion," delivered by Senator FERGUSON on Tuesday, August 28, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

PROPOSED DEPARTMENT OF PEACE—ARTICLE BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WHERRY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "A Department of Peace for the American Government," written by Senator WILEY, and published in the magazine Free World for September 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

FEDERAL INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS BILL—ARTICLE BY SENATOR HATCH

[Mr. BALL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Senator HATCH dealing with the Federal industrial relations bill, published in the Washington Daily News of September 10, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE JEWISH NEW YEAR—STATEMENT BY SENATOR MEAD AND EDITORIAL FROM WASHINGTON STAR

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Rosh Hashonah," published in the Washington Evening Star of September 8, 1945, and a statement issued by him dealing with the Jewish New Year, which appear in the Appendix.]

JOBLESS AID—EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON POST

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial en-

titled "Jobless Aid," dealing with the Kilgore bill to supplement and extend payments under State unemployment compensation laws, published in the Washington Post of September 10, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

OBSTRUCTION OF PRIVATE ENTERPRISE IN THE BUILDING INDUSTRY—EDITORIAL FROM CHARLOTTE OBSERVER

[Mr. HOEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Putting Ring in the Noses of Free People," published in the Charlotte (N. C.) Observer of September 6, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

STILL PLAYING POLITICS—EDITORIAL FROM THE ROCKY MOUNT EVENING TELEGRAM

[Mr. HOEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Still Playing Politics," published in the Evening Telegram, of Rocky Mount, N. C., of August 10, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

FIRST PEACE CONFERENCE—EDITORIAL IN THE NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. MAYBANK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "First Peace Conference," published in the New York Times of September 10, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

WHAT MUST WE GIVE UP TO GET FULL EMPLOYMENT?—EDITORIAL FROM THE BALTIMORE SUN

[Mr. TAFT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "What Must We Give Up to Get 'Full Employment'?" published in the Baltimore Sun of September 10, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

POEM IN TRIBUTE TO THE LATE SENATOR JOHNSON OF CALIFORNIA

[Mr. DOWNEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a poem by Horace C. Carlisle in tribute to the late Senator Johnson of California which appears in the Appendix.]

ORDER DISPENSING WITH THE CALL OF THE CALENDAR

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The morning business is concluded. The calendar, under rule VIII, is in order.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the calendar be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY GENERAL WAINWRIGHT

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, as we all know, General Wainwright arrived in the city today and is to be the guest of the House and the Senate. He is to be at the House at 2:30, and will come immediately from the House to the Senate, arriving here about 5 minutes to 3, whereupon he will be escorted into the Chamber.

It has been suggested that he may wish to make a few brief remarks to the Senate, after which we hope he may remain in the Chamber and allow each Senator to shake hands with him. The ceremony will be brief, but I hope all Senators will be present to greet General Wainwright at about 5 minutes to 3.

FEDERAL AID FOR PUBLIC AIRPORTS

Mr. MCCARRAN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the

consideration of Senate bill 2, to provide Federal aid for public airports.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of the bill (S. 2), to provide for Federal aid for the development, construction, improvement, and repair of public airports in the United States, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That this act may be cited as the "Federal Aid Airport Act."

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 2. As used in this act, unless the context otherwise requires—

(a) "Administrator" means the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics.

(b) "Airport" means any area of land or water which is designed for the landing and take-off of aircraft and all appurtenant areas necessary for buildings or other airport facilities or rights-of-way.

(c) "Airport development" means (1) any construction work involved in constructing, improving, or repairing an airport or portion thereof, including the construction, alteration, and repair of airport administrative buildings and the removal, lowering, relocation, and marking and lighting of airport hazards; and (2) any acquisition of lands or property interests, air rights, or aviation easement therein which is necessary to permit any such construction work or prevent or limit the establishment of airport hazards, but does not include the construction, alteration, or repair of airport hangars.

(d) "Airport hazard" means any structure or object of natural growth located on or in the vicinity of an airport, or any use of land near an airport, which obstructs the airspace required for the flight of aircraft in landing or taking-off at the airport or is otherwise hazardous to such landing or taking-off of aircraft.

(e) "Authorized project" means a project included in the national airport plan provided for in section 6 and, in the case of projects under the urban program, a project which has been selected and authorized as provided in subsection 7 (a).

(f) "Class 3 and smaller airports" means all airports which, as to size, lay-out, and facilities, are not properly classifiable as class 4 or higher class airports according to the airport classification standards of the Administrator stated in Civil Aeronautics Administration Bulletin "Airport Design" dated April 1, 1944.

(g) "Class 4 and larger airports" means all airports which, as to size, lay-out, and facilities, are properly classifiable as class 4 or higher-class airports according to the airport classification standards of the Administrator stated in Civil Aeronautics Administration Bulletin "Airport Design" dated April 1, 1944.

(h) "Military or naval aircraft" means aircraft owned and operated by the United States Army, the United States Navy, the United States Coast Guard, or the United States Marine Corps.

(i) "Population" means the population according to the latest decennial census of the United States.

(j) "Project" means a proposal for the accomplishment of certain airport development with respect to a particular airport.

(k) "Project costs" means all necessary costs involved in accomplishing a project under this act, including those of making field surveys, preparation of plans and specifications, supervision and inspection of construction work, procurement of the accomplishment of such work by contract, and acquisition of property interests, and also including administrative and other incidental costs incurred by a State airport agency or project sponsor specifically in connection with the

accomplishment of a project, and which would not have been incurred otherwise.

(l) "Public agency" means any agency of the Federal Government or of a State, any municipality or other political subdivision, any body politic or public corporation supported by taxes, or any department, commission, board, or official of a municipal or county government, which in the opinion of the Administrator has adequate powers and is suitably equipped and organized to satisfy the requirements of the Administrator for participation in the Federal-aid airport program herein authorized.

(m) "Public airport" means any airport which is used or to be used for public purposes without unjust discrimination, under the control of a public agency, the landing area of which is publicly owned.

(n) "Sponsor" means any non-Federal public agency which meets the requirements prescribed by the Administrator for sponsorship of a project under this act and enters into a contract with the Federal Government, satisfactory to the Administrator, agreeing to operate and maintain the airport to be developed.

(o) "State" means any State of the United States of America, excluding the District of Columbia.

(p) "State airport agency" means any department, commission, board, or official of a State government, which in the opinion of the Administrator has adequate powers and is suitably equipped and organized to satisfy the requirements of the Administrator for participation in the Federal-aid airport program herein authorized.

(q) "State funds" means any funds, other than Federal funds, which are available to a State airport agency or project sponsor for expenditure under this act, including any funds contributed to it by any other non-Federal public agency for use in matching the Federal funds made available for a particular project.

AIRPORT SERVICE

SEC. 3. The Federal-aid airport program authorized by this act shall be administered by the Administrator through an Airport Service which shall be responsible for carrying out all the functions of the Administrator relative to airports and landing areas under sections 301, 302, 303, 306, and 307 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended (49 U. S. C. 451, 452, 453, 456, and 457).

FEDERAL-AID AIRPORT PROGRAM

SEC. 4. In order to bring about the establishment of a Nation-wide system of public airports adequate to meet the present and future needs of civil aeronautics and to promote the interests of national defense, the Administrator is hereby authorized, within the limits of available appropriations made therefor by the Congress, to make grants of funds to the States, their political subdivisions, and other non-Federal public agencies for the development of public airports as hereinafter provided in amounts not to exceed 50 percent of the allowable project costs of each project, except as otherwise provided in section 9 of this act. Such Federal-aid airport program shall consist of two parts, hereinafter referred to as the "State program" and the "urban program." The State program shall include all projects for the development of class 3 and smaller airports and the urban program all projects for the development of class 4 and larger airports. In each program, the State airport agency or project sponsor receiving a grant may use to match such grant any State funds available for the purpose. For purposes of this act, a project shall be considered one for development of an airport of a certain class if upon completion of the airport development proposed, the airport so developed would be properly classifiable as of that class according to the airport classification standards of the Administrator stated in Civil

Aeronautics Administration bulletin Airport Design dated April 1, 1944.

APPROPRIATION AUTHORIZATIONS

SEC. 5. For the purpose of carrying out the Federal-aid airport program authorized by this act, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Administrator, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, \$100,000,000 for the first postwar fiscal year, and \$100,000,000 for each of the four successive postwar fiscal years thereafter, to remain available until expended, of which not to exceed 5 percent shall be available to the Administrator for all necessary planning and research and for all necessary expenses incident to the administration of this act, including the objects specified in section 204 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended (49 U. S. C. 424): *Provided*, That each such appropriation shall specify the maximum amount thereof that may be expended for the development of class 4 and larger airports, in no event exceed 35 percent of the total appropriation. There is also hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Administrator, immediately upon passage of this act, \$3,000,000 for preliminary planning and surveys preparatory to commencement of the program. The first postwar fiscal year shall be that fiscal year which ends on June 30 following the date proclaimed by the President as the termination of the existing war emergency, or following the date specified in a concurrent resolution of the two Houses of Congress as the date of such termination, or following the date on which the Congress by a concurrent resolution of the two Houses finds as a fact that the war emergency heretofore referred to has been relieved to an extent that will justify proceeding with the airport program provided for by this Act, whichever date is the earliest.

NATIONAL AIRPORT PLAN

"SEC. 6. The Administrator is hereby authorized and directed to prepare, and revise annually, a national plan for the development of public airports, which plan shall specify, in terms of general location and type of development, all the airport projects considered necessary to provide a Nation-wide system of public airports adequate to anticipate and meet the needs of civil aeronautics and to promote the interests of national defense. In formulating and revising said plan, the Administrator shall take into account the needs of both air commerce and private flying, the probable technological developments in the science of aeronautics, the likely growth and requirements of civil aeronautics, and such other considerations as he may deem appropriate; and shall consult, and take into consideration the views and recommendations of the Civil Aeronautics Board, the several States, and their political subdivisions. The Administrator shall also consult, and consider the views and recommendations of, the War and Navy Departments as to the extent to which existing facilities constructed for national defense purposes may be made available in whole or in part for civilian use and as to what public airport development is needed for national defense, to the end that all such development included in the said plan and program may be as useful for national defense as is feasible. In carrying out this section the Administrator is authorized to make such surveys, studies, examinations, and investigations as he may deem necessary.

SELECTION OF PROJECTS

SEC. 7. (a) Urban program: At least 2 months prior to the close of each fiscal year, the Administrator shall submit to the Congress a request for authority to undertake during the next fiscal year those of the projects for the development of class 4 and larger

airports, included in the then-current revision of the national airport plan formulated by him under section 6 hereof, which, in his opinion, should be undertaken under the urban program during that fiscal year, together with an estimate of the Federal funds required to pay the share of the United States under this act on account of such projects. In determining which projects to include in such a request, the Administrator shall consider, among other things, the relative aeronautical need for and urgency of the projects included in the plan and the likelihood of securing satisfactory sponsorship of such projects as required by the sponsorship requirements prescribed by him. In allocating and granting any funds that thereafter may be appropriated for the carrying out of the urban program during the next fiscal year, the Administrator shall consider the appropriation as granting the authority requested unless a contrary intent shall have been manifested by the Congress, and no such allocations or grants shall be made unless so authorized.

(b) State program: After deducting from the amount of each appropriation available for grants the amount thereof that may be granted for projects in the urban program, the remainder shall be available for the development of class 3 and smaller airports under the State program, as proposed in the then-current revision of the national airport plan. All such funds shall be apportioned as prescribed in section 8 and shall be granted for the carrying out of projects selected and approved for operation as provided in section 9.

APPORTIONMENT OF FUNDS

SEC. 8. (a) As soon as possible after the beginning of each fiscal year, all Federal funds available for the State program during that fiscal year shall be apportioned by the Administrator among the several States, one-half in the proportion which the population of each State bears to the total population of all the States, and one-half in the proportion which the area of each State bears to the total area of all the States. All sums so apportioned for a State shall be available to pay the United States pro rata share of the allowable project costs of authorized projects in that State, as provided in sections 9, 10, and 11.

(b) Upon making an apportionment or reapportionment, as provided herein, the Administrator shall certify to the governor of each State, and to any public agency having requested such certification, the sums which he has so apportioned or reapportioned for projects within each State for the current fiscal year.

(c) All moneys apportioned hereunder shall be available as apportioned until the close of the fiscal year following the fiscal year for which the apportionment was made. Any apportioned amount which has not been granted at the end of the period during which it is available as apportioned under the terms of this section shall be reapportioned within 60 days thereafter, on the same basis as provided in subsection (a) of this section, among the States in which substantially all currently apportioned funds have been matched by the State or public agencies therein, and which have satisfied the Administrator prior to the close of the preceding fiscal year of their desire and ability to so match funds in excess of the annual apportionment. All sums so reapportioned shall be certified to the governors of the States, and to public agencies in the same way as if they were being apportioned under this act for the first time.

SUBMISSION AND APPROVAL OF PROJECTS

SEC. 9. (a) Any State airport agency representing a State which has complied with the provisions of this act and desires to avail itself of the benefits of the State program, and any public agency desiring to sponsor an authorized project in the urban program,

or an authorized project in the State program if located in a State in which no State airport agency exists, may submit to the Administrator project applications in such form as may be prescribed by the Administrator, setting forth the airport development proposed to be undertaken. Without exception, such projects shall include only such airport development as is included in the then-current revision of the national airport plan formulated by the Administrator under section 6 hereof, and all such proposed development shall be in accordance with standards established by the Administrator, which shall include standards for site selection, airport layout, grading, drainage, seeding, paving, and lighting. Each project application shall be accompanied by such plans, specifications, forms of contract, cost estimates, and other supporting materials as the Administrator may require.

(b) All such projects shall be subject to the approval of the Administrator, which approval shall be given only if the Administrator is satisfied that the project is designed to accomplish the purposes of this act, that sufficient funds are available therefor, that the project will be completed without undue delay, and that all sponsorship requirements prescribed by or under the authority of this act have been or will be met. No project shall be approved by the Administrator with respect to any airport unless a State or a public agency holds good title, in form satisfactory to the Administrator, to the landing area of such airport or the site therefor, or gives assurance satisfactory to the Administrator that such title will be acquired. Unless and until a project is so approved, either as originally proposed or as subsequently revised, the United States shall not pay, nor be obligated to pay, any portion of any costs in connection with such project.

(c) If the Administrator approves any such project, he shall notify the State airport agency or project sponsor. The share of the United States, payable under this act on account of any such project shall not exceed 50 percent of the total estimated project costs thereof: *Provided*, That in the case of any State containing unappropriated and unreserved public lands and nontaxable Indian lands, individual and tribal, exceeding 5 percent of the total area of all lands therein, such share payable to the State airport agency shall be increased by a percentage of the project cost equal to one-half the percentage that the area of all such lands in such State is of its total area.

GRANT AGREEMENTS

SEC. 10. Upon approving a project as provided in section 9, the Administrator shall transmit to the State airport agency, or project sponsor, as the case may be, an offer in behalf of the United States to pay 50 percent of the allowable project costs of said project, or such larger share as may be required by the provisions of section 9, on such terms, and subject to such conditions, as the Administrator may deem necessary to meet the requirements of this act and the regulations prescribed hereunder. Each such offer shall state a definite amount as the maximum obligation of the United States and shall stipulate the obligations to be assumed by the State airport agency or project sponsor. If and when any such offer is accepted in writing by the State airport agency or project sponsor to which it is made, such offer and acceptance shall comprise a grant agreement constituting an obligation of the United States. Unless and until such a grant agreement has been executed with respect to a project under this act, the United States shall not pay, nor be obligated to pay, any portion of the project costs which have been or may be incurred in carrying out that project.

ALLOWABLE PROJECT COSTS

SEC. 11. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this act, the United States shall not

pay, nor be obligated to pay, any portion of a project cost incurred in carrying out a project under either the State program or the urban program, unless the Administrator has first determined that said cost is allowable. A project cost shall be allowable under this act provided—

(a) It was incurred in accomplishing airport development in conformity with approved plans and specifications for an authorized project;

(b) It was incurred subsequent to the execution of a grant agreement with respect to the project in connection with which it was incurred, except that necessary costs of preparing a project, including those of field surveys and the preparation of plans and specifications, and the costs of acquiring property interests necessary for a project, may be allowable even though incurred prior to the execution of the grant agreement for such project, if incurred subsequent to the passage of this act; and

(c) It is reasonable in amount, in the opinion of the Administrator: *Provided*, That if the Administrator determines that a project cost is unreasonable in amount, the amount which he determines would have been reasonable shall be an allowable project cost under this act.

The Administrator is authorized to prescribe such rules and regulations with respect to the auditing of project costs and other matters which he may deem necessary to effectuate this section.

METHOD OF CONSTRUCTION; WAGES AND HOURS

SEC. 12. (a) The construction work and labor in each State shall be done in accordance with its laws, and under the direct supervision of the State airport agency or project sponsor as the case may be, subject to the inspection and approval of the Administrator and in accordance with the rules and regulations made by him pursuant to this act: *Provided*, That a State airport agency or project sponsor may utilize the construction services of other public agencies qualified to perform or supervise the work, including other State agencies: *Provided further*, That all contracts pursuant to this act which involve labor shall contain provisions establishing minimum rates of wages, to be predetermined by the State or project sponsor, which contractors shall pay to skilled and unskilled labor, and such minimum rates shall be stated in the invitation for bids and shall be included in proposals or bids for the work. Such rules and regulations shall require such cost and progress reporting by the State airport agency or project sponsor to the Administrator as the Administrator may by regulation prescribe.

(b) All contracts let for construction projects and all loans and grants pursuant to this act shall contain such provisions as are necessary to insure (1) that no convict labor shall be employed on any such project; (2) that (except in executive, administrative, and supervisory positions), so far as practicable and feasible, no individual directly employed on any such project shall be permitted to work more than 40 hours in any one week; (3) that in the employment of labor in connection with any such project (except in executive, administrative, and supervisory positions), preference shall be given, where they are qualified, first, to persons honorably discharged from the military service of the United States, as defined in section 101 (1) of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Relief Act of 1940, and then to citizens of the United States and aliens who have declared their intention of becoming citizens, who are bona fide residents of the State in which the work is to be performed: *Provided*, That these preferences shall apply only where such labor is available and qualified to perform the work to which the employment relates.

(c) The acquisition of articles, materials, and supplies, wholly or in part with funds

appropriated pursuant to this act, shall be subject to the provisions of section 2, of title III of the Treasury and Post Office Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1934; and all contracts let pursuant to the provisions of this act shall be subject to the provisions of section 3 of title III of such act.

(d) Any allocation, grant, or other distribution of funds for any project, pursuant to this act, shall contain stipulations which will provide for the application of title III of the Treasury and Post Office Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1934, to the acquisition of articles, materials, and supplies for use in carrying out such project.

GRANT PAYMENTS

SEC. 13. The Administrator is authorized to prescribe rules and regulations governing the manner in which payments shall be made under grant agreements executed pursuant to section 10: *Provided*, That no advance payments shall be made, except that partial payments may be made as work progresses or project costs are incurred, in such amounts, and at such times, as the Administrator may deem advisable. All grant payments shall be made to such official, or officials, or depository, as may be designated by the State airport agency or project sponsor entitled to such grants, and authorized under the laws of the State to receive public funds.

ELIGIBILITY OF STATES

SEC. 14. (a) To be eligible for participation in the benefits of the State program, a State shall, except as provided in subsection (b) of this section, satisfy the Administrator that it meets the following requirements for such participation:

(1) Its legislature shall have assented to the provisions of this act and to its acceptance of Federal airport aid on the terms and conditions prescribed by the Administrator hereunder: *Provided*, That until the final adjournment of the first regular session of the legislature of such State convening after approval of this act, the assent of the Governor of the State shall be sufficient.

(2) The State shall have a State airport agency as defined herein.

(3) The State shall have adequate legislation to enable its political subdivisions to participate in the benefits of both the State program and the urban program, either by sponsoring projects therein or otherwise.

(4) The State shall have adequate legislation for the prevention and removal of airport hazards by airport zoning under the State police power and the acquisition of property or air rights or aviation easements therein.

(5) The State shall have taken adequate steps to insure that all airports developed within the State under the State program will be operated and managed in the public interest without unjust discrimination in favor of or against any person or class of persons.

(6) The State shall have taken adequate steps to insure the proper maintenance, with due regard to climatic and flood conditions, of all airports developed within the State under the State program.

(7) The State shall have taken adequate steps to insure the availability each year of the State funds required for the development and maintenance of all airports developed or to be developed within the State under the State program.

(b) The requirements of paragraphs (2) to (7), inclusive, of subsection (a) of this section shall be suspended during a period of 3 years from and after the date of approval of this act.

(c) Federal aid shall be extended under this act only to projects located in States which expend or obligate during any 1 year at least an amount of money equal to the State's revenue during that year from any taxes on aviation fuel as such, and any other special fees or taxes imposed on aircraft,

aviation, or aeronautical facilities or operations, excepting income taxes and taxes on corporations as such, for the development, construction, improvement, and repair of public airports, and administrative expenses in connection therewith, including the retirement of bonds for the payment of which such revenues have been pledged.

PROJECT SPONSORSHIP

SEC. 15. (a) As a condition precedent to his approval of an airport project under this act, the Administrator shall assure himself to the extent feasible, that—

(1) the airport will be available for public use on fair and reasonable terms;

(2) the airport and all facilities thereon or connected therewith will be suitably operated and maintained, with due regard to climatic and flood conditions;

(3) the aerial approaches of the airport will be adequately cleared and protected by removing, lowering, relocating, marking, and lighting or otherwise mitigating existing airport hazards and by preventing the establishment or creation of future airport hazards so far as existing legislation permits;

(4) all the facilities of the airport developed with Federal aid and all those usable for the landing and take-off of aircraft will be available to the United States for unrestricted use by military and naval aircraft in common with other aircraft at all times without charge other than a charge sufficient to defray the cost of repairing damage done by such aircraft or, if the use by military and naval aircraft shall be substantial, a reasonable share, proportional to such use, of the cost of operating and maintaining the facilities so used;

(5) the airport operator or owner will furnish the Government at a reasonable rent therefor such space in airport buildings as may be reasonably adequate for use by the Government in connection with any airport air-traffic control, or weather reporting, and communications activities pertinent thereto which the Government may wish to establish at the airport;

(6) all project accounts and records will be kept in accordance with a standard system of accounting prescribed by the Administrator;

(7) the airport operator or owner will submit to the Administrator such annual or special airport financial and operations reports as the Administrator may reasonably request; and

(8) the airport and all airport records will be available for inspection by any duly authorized agent of the Administrator upon reasonable request. To provide such assurance, the Administrator shall prescribe such project-sponsorship requirements as he may deem necessary, consistent with the terms of this act: *Provided*, That nothing contained in such regulations shall be construed to require any State or State airport agency to acquire any airport owned by any other public agency, to assume control over the operation of any such airport, or to sponsor a project which any other public agency is desirous of sponsoring. Among other steps to insure compliance with such requirements, the Administrator is authorized to enter into contracts with the States and other public agencies, on behalf of the United States, and such contracts shall be enforceable by decrees for specific performance.

ACQUISITION OF PROPERTY FOR STATES AND PROJECT SPONSORS

SEC. 16. Whenever it is the opinion of the Administrator that any real or personal property or interest therein necessary in connection with a project under this act cannot be acquired by the State, or by the public agency sponsoring the project, without undue expense or delay, the Administrator may, at the request of such State or public agency, institute a proceeding for the condemnation of such property or interest therein in accord-

ance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to expedite the construction of public buildings and works outside of the District of Columbia by enabling possession and title of sites to be taken in advance of final judgment in proceedings for the acquisition thereof under the power of eminent domain," approved February 26, 1931 (U. S. C., 1940 edition, title 40, secs. 258a to 258e, inclusive), the entire cost of which acquisition shall be borne by the State or project sponsor out of the combined Federal and non-Federal funds available for such project. When so acquired by the United States, such property or interest therein shall be conveyed to the State supplying funds for its acquisition or to the public agency sponsoring the project, as may be appropriate.

USE OF GOVERNMENT-OWNED LANDS

SEC. 17. (a) Whenever the Administrator determines that use of any lands owned or controlled by the United States is reasonably necessary for the development of an airport under this act, or for the operation of any public airport, he shall file with the head of the department or agency having control of such lands a request that such property interest therein as he may deem necessary be conveyed to the State airport agency of the State in which the lands are located or to the public agency sponsoring the project or owning or controlling the airport, as he may designate. Such property interest may consist of the title or any lesser estate or interest in property, including any leasehold estate or aviation or other easement or right-of-way.

(b) If within a period of 4 months after such filing the said department or agency head shall not have certified to the Administrator that the requested conveyance is contrary to the public interest or inconsistent with the needs of that department or agency, the said department or agency head is hereby authorized and directed, with the approval of the President and the Attorney General of the United States, and without any expense whatsoever to the United States, to perform any acts and to execute any instruments necessary to make the conveyance requested: *Provided*, That each such conveyance shall be made on the condition that the property interest conveyed shall automatically revert to the United States in the event that the lands in question are not developed, or cease to be used, for airport purposes.

REIMBURSEMENT FOR DAMAGE BY ARMY OR NAVY

SEC. 18. (a) The Administrator is authorized to reimburse States or public agencies for the necessary rehabilitation or repair of public airports substantially damaged by the Army or the Navy, or both. The Administrator is authorized on behalf of the United States to consider, ascertain, adjust, and determine in accordance with regulations he shall prescribe pursuant to this section, any claim submitted by any State or public agency for reimbursement of the cost of necessary rehabilitation or repair of a public airport, under the control or management of such State or public agency, substantially damaged by the Army or the Navy, or both.

(b) Such amount as may be found to be due to any claimant under this section shall be certified by the Administrator to Congress for payment out of appropriations that may be made by Congress therefor. Such certification shall include a brief statement of the character of each claim, the amount claimed, and the amount allowed. No claim shall be considered by the Administrator pursuant to this section unless notice of intention to file such claim has been presented to him within 30 days after the occurrence of the damage upon which the claim is based, except that in case of damage caused by operations of a military nature during time of war such notice may be filed within 60 days after termination of the war.

REPORTING TO CONGRESS

SEC. 19. On or before the first Monday in February of each year the Administrator shall make a report to the Congress on his operations under this Act during the preceding fiscal year, which shall include detailed statements of the Federal-aid airport development accomplished, the status of each project undertaken, the allocation of appropriations, and itemized statement of expenditures and receipts, and his recommendations, if any, for new legislation amending or supplementing this act. The Administrator shall also make such special reports as the Congress may request.

FALSE STATEMENTS

SEC. 20. Any officer, agent, or employee of the United States, or any officer, agent, or employee of any State or public agency, or any person, association, firm, or corporation who shall knowingly make any false statement, false representation, or false report as to the character, quality, quantity, or cost of the material used or to be used, or the quantity or quality of the work performed or to be performed, or the costs thereof, in connection with the submission of plans, maps, specifications, contracts, or estimates of construction costs for any project submitted to the Administrator for approval under the provisions of this Act or shall knowingly make any false statement, false representation, or false report or claim for work or materials for any project approved by the Administrator under this Act, or shall knowingly make any false statement or false representation in any report required to be made under this act, or any acts supplementary thereto, with the intent to defraud the United States shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by imprisonment for not to exceed 5 years or by a fine of not to exceed \$10,000, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

EXISTING AIRPORT PROGRAMS

SEC. 21. Nothing in this act shall affect the carrying out of the program for the development of public landing areas necessary for national defense, authorized by the Department of Commerce Appropriation Act, 1945, or the program for the development of civil landing areas, authorized by the First Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1944, which programs shall be additional to the Federal-aid airport program authorized herein.

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 22. This act shall take effect on the date of its approval.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I wish to ask the Senator from Nevada a question. As the Senator knows, there has been a jurisdictional question pending as to which committee should handle the subject of aviation. I do not wish to oppose consideration of Senate bill 2 at this time on the basis of jurisdiction, because I consider the bill to be of great importance. I feel that the Senator from Nevada has worked long and hard on aviation matters, and that we should not oppose or support a bill merely because one committee or another has handled it. I take it, however, the Senator from Nevada does not consider that the passage of this bill would in any way be considered to be a precedent respecting which committee should handle aviation matters.

Mr. McCARRAN. The bill now before the Senate is not involved in the motions bearing on the question of jurisdiction, which motions are pending before this

body and have been pending before it for some time. The motions were not addressed to this bill. Let me state further that I do not believe, in view of the nature of this bill, that its consideration at this time or its approval at this time at all involves the question of jurisdiction between the two committees.

Mr. McFARLAND. And when the question of jurisdiction is finally to be settled, then this bill should not be taken as a precedent one way or the other?

Mr. McCARRAN. That is my theory of the case entirely.

Mr. McFARLAND. I thank the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, development of a network of public airports which will effectively serve the potential air traffic of the United States is of vital importance to every American community. I may say that its importance has within the last few days been emphasized by the message of the President of the United States.

Airways are the preferred highways of the future. The growth of air transportation, properly encouraged, will parallel the growth of surface highway transportation, and can give rise to the growth of an aviation industry which will fill a place in our postwar economy comparable to the place filled by the automobile industry after the last war.

Very few American communities are in a position to develop satisfactory airport facilities solely on the basis of their own resources. Without such facilities, a community will be, in the postwar world, unable to tap and benefit by the advantages of air travel and air transport.

Unless the Congress recognizes the tremendous postwar importance of an adequate system of public airports and makes provision for Federal aid in the construction of such airports, it will be impossible for this country to keep pace with the potentialities for growth inherent in the aviation industry.

The aviation industry is in a position to grow hugely after the war. That growth can be hampered or accelerated by what the Congress decides to do with regard to Federal-aid for airport construction.

Whether we consider an airport program more nearly comparable to highway construction, or to the development of rivers and harbors, the justification for Federal expenditures to develop airports is beyond argument.

The Federal Government has spent billions of dollars in developing highways, and the national benefits from that expenditure are obvious to all of us.

The Federal Government has also spent billions in the improvement of rivers and harbors; and the benefits of those expenditures are also obvious.

For development of railroads, Federal expenditures have run into the hundreds of millions.

If Senators want the figures, here they are:

The Federal expenditures on various forms of transportation include more than \$3,000,000,000 for rivers and harbors; more than \$6,500,000,000 for highways, exclusive of the appropriation of \$1,700,000,000 recently approved; and

more than \$800,000,000 for the development of rail transportation.

Widespread public awareness of the national importance of airport development was clearly demonstrated at hearings on my bill, S. 2, before the aviation subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Commerce. Every witness who appeared before the subcommittee to testify on this legislation was in favor of the Federal-aid program which this bill authorizes. Witnesses showed some differences of opinion with regard to the mechanics of the program; but with regard to the need, they were in complete agreement.

Witness after witness pointed out serious deficiencies in our present system of airports. Statements by these witnesses concerning advantages certain to flow from a Federal-aid airport program were highly illuminating. Included among the advantages claimed were the following:

First. Stimulation of the aviation industry in all phases of commercial transport.

Second. Encouragement of unprecedented growth of private flying.

Third. Increased income and employment in all industries either directly or indirectly serving aviation.

Fourth. Direct provision of many thousands of jobs in the airport construction program itself.

Fifth. Development of thousands of small-business opportunities in the operation of airports.

Sixth. Improvement of air-mail service.

Seventh. Stimulation of pilot training.

Eighth. Promotion of the national defense.

This is by no means a complete list, and those desiring to get the full picture of the benefits offered by the proposed Federal-aid airport program will be interested in reading the full transcript of the hearings. The testimony of the many witnesses who were heard leaves no doubt that Mr. William A. M. Burden, Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Air, was wholly correct when he summarized his testimony with the statement that "A well-conceived Federal-aid airport program will be a sound investment from all these points of view—the national economy, tax revenues, the convenience of the public, and the national defense."

To reap the fullest benefits from a Federal-aid airport program it must be authorized soon enough to permit necessary basic planning to be completed before the end of the war. Do this, and the program will be ready to go immediately when peace comes, and to do its share in providing jobs during the reconversion period. Wait until the war is over to authorize this program, and we shall have to do without its benefits during the period of a year or more which will be required for planning.

If we miss this chance to foster proper growth of our aviation industry, we shall be throwing away one of our finest opportunities to contribute to postwar prosperity.

I ask that the amendment reported by the committee be read section by section. I shall be glad to explain as best

I can as we go along, if Senators will propound questions to me.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. One question which occurred to me when I read the bill was whether there was to be any return whatever for the Federal grants to airports, or to cities or States which may get the money. Is it proposed that there shall be an outright grant, for which there will be no return?

Mr. McCARRAN. It is in the same category as are grants for highways. It is an outright grant.

Mr. TAFT. Take an airport such as the new Idlewild Airport of New York, costing the city of New York \$160,000,000 or \$170,000,000, or the airport proposed in my home city, to cost about \$5,000,000. Those cities make contracts with the air lines, and they receive very substantial rent. Consequently, if this really is an investment, with an income return—in fact, I do not see why, as airports develop, they should not be financed almost entirely by the air lines themselves—why should not the Federal Government share in the return, just as the city shares in the return?

Mr. McCARRAN. The bill provides that all the revenue of an airport must be expended in the development of the airport and the improvement of the service. The return to the Federal Government is much greater than the mere pittance that would come from the revenue of an airport.

Mr. TAFT. Take the airport to which I refer in Cincinnati. The cost is estimated to be \$5,000,000. Roughly speaking, there will be a return which will pay the interest and the sinking-fund charges on \$2,500,000. So if the Federal Government contributes the other \$2,500,000, the airport will not cost the city of Cincinnati a cent. It will get the airport for nothing.

Mr. McCARRAN. I know that the Senator does not forget the fact that the city which he mentions serves a great community, and that travel into that city by air is growing by leaps and bounds. That travel is something which gives aid to the entire country.

Mr. TAFT. That travel is growing so fast that eventually it is going to pay for all these airports, I think, so that really there is to be no particular loss. It will be an investment, rather than an expenditure.

Mr. McCARRAN. That might be true; but, on the other hand, every airport must serve in the way of national defense. That is one factor. Perhaps we are not thinking so much in those terms at this time, but nevertheless it is an item. Secondly, they must serve the Nation. Accordingly, we could not call upon the air lines to build the airports, because they would build them when, as, and if they saw fit.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina in the chair). Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Are not the provisions of this bill analogous to those of the high-

way program bill? Under that bill, the money to be put into the highways by the Federal Government will not come back to it, and no income will accrue directly to it on that account? The income from the highways, in the form of automobile registration taxes all goes to the States where the highways are located and is used in the maintenance of the highways. Would a corresponding situation probably exist in the case of the airports?

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct. But let us go a little further. In the matter of rivers and harbors there is no direct return to the Federal Government from the grants. There is no return from the harbor or river which is improved or taken care of, but it is a national asset, and certainly we would not refuse to support it.

Mr. President, I inquire if there are any other questions?

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. What is approximately the total amount which is contemplated to be expended?

Mr. McCARRAN. By this bill, \$500,000,000 of Federal money will be expended over a period of 5 years.

Mr. WILEY. The expenditure will be at the rate of \$100,000,000 a year. Is that correct?

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct; it will be \$100,000,000 a year, and the program is for 5 years.

Let me say in that respect that there is now pending in the House of Representatives a similar bill which carries approximately \$650,000,000 or more. That money must be matched. It must be matched by either the States which secure Federal grants or by the municipalities which secure Federal grants, and in that respect I propose to dwell in a moment on how this bill is divided in its provisions.

Mr. WILEY. I was interested in the approach of the Senator from Ohio, in view of the fact that the Government indebtedness is now reaching \$270,000,000,000, and undoubtedly toward the end of the year will amount to \$300,000,000,000. Although I sat in the committee which considered this measure, I think we might well take cognizance of a related matter. When we consider what the Senator has characterized as imperative needs—and this is one of them from the standpoint of national defense and from the standpoint of future development of travel in the air—I think we might well consider a further element, namely, that with the tremendous load on the Federal Government, with the Federal Government unable to balance its Budget, although it is not actually bankrupt, when we make these disbursements we must consider the question of getting a return at some time, if the enterprises become profitable, so that the States or private organizations benefit. In other words, we must consider whether a return shall be received on the expenditures the Government makes. As I see the matter, when we look ahead a few months we must be thinking of raising in peacetime approximately from \$23,000,000,000 to \$27,000,000,000 a year to meet the actual

overhead of government, interest on bonds, and the money necessary to take care of the Army and Navy. That means we must look to all the sources we can for legitimate revenue to go into the National Treasury.

So it seems to me that those who are looking after the financial end of the Government—in other words, the Finance and Ways and Means and Means Committees—might well consider when it is proposed to put \$500,000,000 here or \$1,000,000,000 there, or \$1,000,000,000 somewhere else to aid worthy national projects, the question whether there is a possibility of getting any tax returns or revenue returns for the Federal Government. I ask the Senator's opinion regarding that rather poorly stated problem.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me at this point?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. I should like to ask the able Senator from Nevada if it is really contemplated that any profit is to be derived from the operation of these airports. The history of airports shows, I think, that there have been only one or two which have made any profit. Many of them are not self-sustaining. The only profit which could be made by a municipality or a State, let us say, in operating an airport would be from the sale of gasoline or from certain concessions, such as the sale of soft drinks and the operation of restaurant facilities. But the larger the airport and the more it is used, the higher the cost of maintenance; and whatever income is derived by a municipality or by a State from one of these airports will, I think, as a rule—and I shall ask the Senator from Nevada to correct me if I am mistaken—be consumed in the maintenance and further development of the airport.

Mr. McCARRAN. This bill provides specifically for that. That is the only avenue through which the income can be expanded.

In view of the fact that the able Senator has asked a question of me, let me reply briefly. It will be noted that in my opening statement, I dwelt on only a few of the things which will grow out of this measure. They are things which touch upon industry, which build individual industries throughout the country which result in the construction of aircraft, the erection of buildings, all tax-producing institutions, all producing taxes and all producing employment everywhere where throughout the country. So while there will be no money coming back directly from an airport grant, nevertheless it will come back in the form of taxes, either through the gasoline taxes or through the creation of property of various forms.

Mr. McFARLAND and Mr. WILEY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nevada yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield first to the Senator from Arizona, if the Senator from Wisconsin will defer his question for a moment.

Mr. McFARLAND. Will the Senator tell us what consideration was given to the plans of the Army and Navy in regard

to the postwar use of these airfields? Did the Army and Navy present their views?

Mr. McCARRAN. The Army and Navy did present their views, and amendments were worked into the bill in keeping with the suggestions of the Army and the Navy.

Mr. McFARLAND. I had understood although not officially—that they were not satisfied with the bill, particularly insofar as the use of class 4 and class 5 airfields is concerned.

Mr. McCARRAN. We have had no report from them to that effect. They did offer some suggestions. They came before the Committee on Commerce and made their suggestions. Those suggestions were, I think almost unanimously, worked into the bill by the committee. The Army and Navy will have absolute use of the airports; they will have the right to call in time of necessity, whenever they deem it necessary, for the use of any airport for military purposes.

Mr. McFARLAND. I did not find in the hearings any testimony from the Army and Navy.

Mr. McCARRAN. There was testimony, as my recollection serves me, or else there were statements from the Army and Navy which contained suggestions. It was either one or the other. My memory does not serve me now in that regard.

Mr. McFARLAND. Have they made a report as to what airports they might release—airports which could be used under this program?

Mr. McCARRAN. No; they have not. I wish to say to the Senator that although I have tried a number of times to find out, I have been unable to get any answer, because invariably they say, "We do not have the program worked out now; we do not know what airports may be released; we do not know what airports we may need; we do not know what our future programs are."

Mr. McFARLAND. I can understand that during the war it would have been very difficult for them to work out a postwar program.

Mr. McCARRAN. Let me invite the attention of the Senator, if I may interrupt him, to the language on page 35 of the bill:

The Administrator—

That is, the Administrator of the Civil Aeronautics Authority, a Federal officer—

shall also consult, and consider the views and recommendations of, the War and Navy Departments as to the extent to which existing facilities constructed for national defense purposes may be made available in whole or in part for civilian use and as to what public airport development is needed for national defense, to the end that all such development included in the said plan and program may be as useful for national defense as is feasible.

Mr. McFARLAND. There is nothing which compels the Administrator to accept any suggestion, or any board to make the decision; it is left entirely up to the Civil Aeronautics Authority, is it not?

Mr. McCARRAN. The language seems to me to be sufficiently plain. It reads:

The Administrator shall also consult, and consider the views and recommendations of,

the War and Navy Departments as to the extent to which existing facilities constructed for national defense purposes may be made available.

That answers that part of the Senator's question as to what airports the Army or the Navy might be ready to release. Of course, it all goes to the question of where, when, and how airports may be constructed by the CAA. Then the latter portion of the language is as follows:

To the end that all such development included in the said plan and program may be as useful for national defense as is feasible.

Mr. McFARLAND. I do not want the Senator from Nevada to understand that I am taking the position that the Army and Navy should control entirely the situation, but I believe that where money can be saved by using an airport jointly, that course should be followed.

Mr. McCARRAN. I may say to the Senator in furtherance of his suggestion, that on page 17 of the hearings the Acting Secretary of the Navy, H. Struve Hensel, in his communication of March 14, 1945, addressed to the chairman of the Commerce Committee, said in part:

The Navy Department is in full accord with any program to increase and improve the system of airports and airport facilities and hence would favor the enactment of such proposed legislation, providing the foregoing recommendations are incorporated in the bills.

Those recommendations were incorporated by the committee and are now in the pending bill.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I should like to ask the able Senator from Nevada whether this bill gives the Administrator the necessary power to make grants to cities and to States for the construction of airports.

Mr. McCARRAN. My answer to the Senator's question is "Yes."

Mr. LUCAS. In other words—

Mr. McCARRAN. Just a moment; I should like to answer the Senator more fully. I wish to make a complete answer because the subject is an important one.

There are two phases to this bill. The reason for that is that the Governors of the respective States came forward and asked for full and absolute control of the Federal moneys which would be granted for the building of airports in the respective States. On the other hand, mayors of cities came before the committee and asked—

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I should appreciate it if the Senator would also recognize the other side of the Chamber on this very highly important matter and speak so that we on this side of the Senate may hear him.

Mr. McCARRAN. I am sorry. I shall try to speak louder. As I was about to say that mayors of various cities also came before the committee and asked that the Federal moneys be allocated to the municipalities. How did the committee handle that vexatious problem? To my mind the committee handled it by compromising in what I feel was a commendable manner. We provided that for the State program; that is the program to be sponsored by the respec-

tive States, 65 percent of the appropriation would be allocated by the Administrator. If, for example, \$100,000,000 should be appropriated this year for the building of airports, the Administrator would allocate 65 percent of that money to the State program, and 35 percent would be allocated to the urban program.

We did more than that. We tried to safeguard the situation a little further by providing that airports in classes 1, 2, and 3, which are the smaller airports, should belong to the State program, and that the airports in classes 4 and 5, the larger airports, should be a part of the urban program. However, the State may join with a city in constructing a No. 4 airport or a No. 5 airport. In other words, we have given the cities an opportunity to go forward with their programs as they may see fit to do so.

Mr. LUCAS. In other words, if I understand the able Senator correctly, if a State and a city wish to join in a program to build an airport and come to the Federal Government and say in effect, "We have joined in a program for the building of an airport," the Federal Government will agree to it. On the other hand, if the city of Chicago, for example, should say, "We want to build our airport separately and we do not want the State to have anything to do with it," under such an arrangement the Federal Government would grant the city of Chicago the right to build its own airport without any State interference of any kind whatever.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct, and there would be allocated to the city of Chicago the money which the Administrator or the CAA believed to be sufficient to meet the requirements.

Mr. LUCAS. I congratulate the committee in reporting the kind of a bill which it has reported to the Senate, because it is exactly what the Senator from Illinois feels is the correct solution of a very difficult problem.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President—

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, if the Senator from Nevada yield, let me say that New York has a problem similar to that to which the Senator from Illinois has referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina in the chair). Does the Senator yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. McCARRAN. I first yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. McMAHON. I have in my hand a booklet entitled "National Airport Plan," which purports to be a letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce transmitting a report of a survey of the need for a system of airports and landing areas throughout the United States. I presume the Senator from Nevada is familiar with the proposed plan.

Mr. McCARRAN. I believe I am familiar with it.

Mr. McMAHON. Does it meet with the Senator's approval as an implementation of the provisions of the pending bill?

Mr. McCARRAN. I would answer the question "Yes," but I have not made a study with reference to the location or the locale of the airports to which reference is made in the plan. I did not be-

lieve that to be a part of my particular duty.

Mr. McMAHON. I am happy to hear that, because I have been examining this plan and I have found, for example, that \$15,600 was allocated for an airport at Antelope Island, Utah. Investigation has disclosed that at that point there is but one family and a herd of moose. Certainly at that point an airport is not needed to fly moose meat into Chicago, because the rationing of meat is about over. I return to the Senator's State of Nevada and I find under this plan for which we are asked to appropriate several hundred million dollars, 73 airports have been projected for cities or towns in Nevada, 22 of which have a population of less than a hundred people. I am glad to know that the Senator does not adhere to the plan to implement this bill, because to my mind it is as fantastic as anything I have ever seen in my life.

Mr. McCARRAN. Let me say that the people of Nevada travel in a very high class manner, and therefore they want air everywhere. [Laughter.] That is perhaps not a sufficient reason. But aside from being facetious in the matter, many selections of airports in various States of the Union were undoubtedly made early in the agitation for airports which I believe would not now be given consideration at all.

Mr. McMAHON. I am glad to hear the Senator say that, because the projected plans in my own State of Connecticut do not meet with my idea of what is necessary for air transportation in that State.

Mr. McCARRAN. Under the pending bill, if the State of New York, for example, had an aviation group or an aviation commission—or whether it had or not—the Governor of the State, acting through the highway department of that State, may come forward and say to the Civil Aeronautics Authority, "We want to build an airport at a certain place," and the officials may say, "We do not want the airport to be built there."

Mr. McMAHON. Suppose the Administrator in Nevada says that he wants to build an airport on Antelope Island, must we go along with the proposal.

Mr. McCARRAN. The island to which the Senator refers is in Utah, and that would change the situation somewhat. Furthermore the CAA might say, "There is no reason for building an airport there, and if it were built there, it could not be maintained, and therefore we will not go along with such a project."

Mr. McMAHON. I call the Senator's attention to the fact that this is their proposal. They are proposing, if we pass the bill, to locate an airport on Antelope Island. Antelope Island will go without an airport, so far as I am concerned.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. MEAD. It occurs to me that it is appropriate for me to take advantage of the generous offer of the sponsor of the bill and ask a question at this point, because it bears on the matter which has been suggested by the distinguished and able Senator from Illinois.

I have here a telegram from the mayor of the city of New York which brings out

what is in his mind with reference to the provisions of the bill. Directing the telegram to me, he says:

I am informed that Senate bill No. 2 providing for national air program will come up for debate Monday. May I call your attention that the McCarran bill differs from the House bill in that it channels Federal funds through the States instead of going directly to the cities?

I was wondering if the money allocated to the cities was to be channeled through the States.

Mr. McCARRAN. No. The same telegram was read to me on Saturday by the senior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER]. I am convinced that the mayor of New York has been misinformed, because Mayor LaGuardia testified before the committee in favor of Senate bill 2, and at this time it was not as favorable to his position as it is today, because then it provided that only 25 percent should be allotted to municipalities and 75 percent to the States. We later changed it and provided 35 percent for the urban or municipal program, and 65 percent for the State program.

Mr. MEAD. While I knew that the change from 25 percent to 35 percent had been made, which I thought was a fairly good compromise, it occurred to me that there was some difficulty in that the funds would be channeled through the State agency, leaving the city to go to the State agency rather than to the Federal Government.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is not the fact. The city of New York can come to the CAA and say, "We want to build this airport." Then the CAA and the city of New York go over the plans for the airport, then the CAA must make the offer, under the bill, that they will put up a certain amount of money, up to one-half, or whatever it may be to build the airport. On the other hand, the State of New York can join with the city of New York and say, "We will both go in and sponsor this airport," and both go to the Civil Aeronautics Authority and ask for the allotment.

Mr. MEAD. Will the Senator explain briefly the difference between the House and the Senate proposals, because the mayor quotes the House provision and says, "The House agrees with our views." And when he says "our views," he means the views of the conference of mayors.

Mr. McCARRAN. I have not read the House bill closely, but I understand that the House bill favors allocating all the money directly to the municipalities.

Mr. MEAD. And not through the States?

Mr. McCARRAN. Not through the States at all. I may be in error in that, and I should want to be corrected if I were, because I have not read the House bill carefully. My understanding is that it favors the plan of giving the money directly to the municipalities, and favors it on the basis of the very argument the mayor makes in the message, wherein he says that the airports referred to have been constructed by the municipalities, which is true. The municipalities have constructed nearly all the important airports of this country. The airports in Chicago, in New York, in St. Louis—all the large airports—have been con-

structed by the municipalities, not by the States. But now the States should have a right to participate, where they see fit to select a site which perhaps is not sufficiently large in population or taxable property to maintain an airport, and should therefore have State assistance.

Mr. MEAD. But the 35 percent which is allocated to the cities may go directly from the Federal authority to the city authority without being channeled through the State?

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct.

Mr. MEAD. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HILL and Mr. LUCAS addressed the chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nevada yield, and if so to whom?

Mr. McCARRAN. I promised to yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. LUCAS. Will the Senator from Alabama defer to permit me to ask merely one question?

Mr. HILL. If the Senator desires to ask a question, certainly.

Mr. LUCAS. I inquire whether the report on the bill made by the Committee on Commerce was unanimous.

Mr. McCARRAN. My recollection is that it was.

Mr. LUCAS. I saw no minority views, and I was interested in that question.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator what part, if any, the War and Navy Departments would play so far as the location of an airport is concerned. Would the War and Navy Departments be consulted at all?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes. I read the provision of the bill. May I read it again?

Mr. HILL. I wish the Senator would do so.

Mr. McCARRAN. On page 35 of the bill, beginning in line 8, it is provided:

The Administrator shall also consult, and consider the views and recommendations of, the War and Navy Departments as to the extent to which existing facilities constructed for national defense purposes may be made available in whole or in part for civilian use and as to what public airport development is needed for national defense, to the end that all such development included in the said plan and program may be as useful for national defense as is feasible.

Mr. HILL. As I read that language, it occurred to me it was rather broad and somewhat general. Certainly that is true with reference to airports to be constructed in the future. The language merely says the authority shall consult the Army and Navy Departments to see whether airports are needed for national defense. That might be very broad and very general, and have little application to particular airports and their construction, might it not?

Mr. McCARRAN. We are confronted with the other side of the question; that is, I do not believe Congress would approve a dominating hand by either the Army or the Navy to the extent that they could say, "No; you cannot locate an airport there," or "You must locate an airport here." I think the breadth of the language lends force to its purpose. In other words, the Nation is putting \$100,000,000 a year into this program, and, so

far as we can, we direct the Administrator to confer with the Army and the Navy authorities before any airport is constructed. If they say, "We do not approve of that," it is a question then of working it out. But I should not wish to sponsor a bill which would provide that the Army must approve, because I have had 2 or 3 years' experience, and I know it is pretty hard to get approval.

Mr. HILL. That may be true, but it seems to me that the language is now too broad and too general, and not sufficiently specific or definite. It seems to me that the language of the bill might be satisfied even if there were no consultation as to whether an airport was needed for national defense. If the Federal Government over a period of years is to spend all this money to build airports, certainly, in my opinion, the airports should be tied in with our defense program, whatever that program might be. I do not think that is accomplished by the language of the bill.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is exactly the object of the language of the bill. That is why this language was inserted. We hoped we would coordinate with the defense agencies, and obtain their consideration and their advice looking to the national defense.

Mr. HILL. Would it be the Senator's idea that under this language, whenever a large airport—an airport of class 4 or 5, let us say—is built, certainly the views and the recommendations of the War and Navy Departments should absolutely be had before any action was taken?

Mr. McCARRAN. I should certainly say emphatically "yes," that they should be consulted and that they would be consulted, and that the language is mandatory that they be consulted. That would be my view, interpreting the language.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, there is not only the point the Senator has raised with respect to the Army and the Navy but there is also another important point, and that is that it often happens that airports are located near Army installations and are extremely harmful to those installations. The program ought to be worked out with the Army so that airports are not developed which will be detrimental to the necessary activities of Army or Navy airports.

Mr. McCARRAN. I very much agree with that statement, and I think that matter is entirely emphasized by the language of the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The Senator feels that that point is sufficiently covered?

Mr. McCARRAN. I certainly do. And, so far as I am concerned, in my expressions here on the floor, in considering that language I wish it to be so understood that the Civil Aeronautics Authority in locating aviation facilities shall consult with the Army and Navy where it might be possible that such facilities would interfere with an Army or a Navy installation.

Mr. BREWSTER rose.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I desire to interrupt the Senator from Nevada further after the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] has finished.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. In connection with what the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] have said, the most monumental example of interference is in the Washington National Airport, which destroyed the usefulness of the Army and Navy airports across the river, because large airports of that nature cannot be located within a mile of each other without having inevitable confusion and chaos; so we certainly have, right under our noses, a most outstanding example of the danger of such a situation.

I wish to express full concurrence with what the Senators who have just spoken have said regarding these dangers. But I think, on the other hand, it would be dangerous to give the Army or the Navy any veto power, because this is primarily a civilian development. Probably 90 percent of the airports will not be primarily of military use, and the great airport program of the country will have to be developed primarily for commercial and civilian flying as distinct from the military aviation. I have, however, never heard any suggestion heretofore that the Civil Aeronautics Authority would not consult the military authorities in connection with the location of the airports which they plan over the country.

I wanted, however, in connection with the previous matter which was discussed by the Senator from New York and the Senator from Illinois, to make it clear to the minds of the Senators present that a rather fundamental issue is presented in connection with the urban airport program concerning which the Council of State Governors is in rather serious disagreement with the Conference of Mayors, and at the appropriate time an amendment looking to the channeling of the funds through the State agencies, without in any way prejudicing the allocation of funds to the larger airports in the urban communities will be presented for consideration so that that issue may be passed upon by the Members of the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada again yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I desire to call the Senator's attention to the suggestion which was made by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] a few moments ago in regard to taking care of the cost of this program. I noticed that the Senator from Nevada in his reply to the Senator from Wisconsin made the statement that since these airports and aviation generally would contribute to the development of industry, which pays taxes, that indirectly the program would pay its way. I should like to call the Senator's attention to the fact that our highways certainly contribute to every form of economic wealth and to every form of industry in this country, and yet our highway systems, both those constructed by the States and the counties, and those constructed by the Federal Government, are entirely supported by special taxes laid on motorists. I

have been wondering if it is not possible to work out some sort of a program whereby aviation would pay its own way. I understand the industry must use a high octane gas, and I wonder if there could not be a special tax laid on such gas so that the industry might carry its own load, because, as the Senator from Wisconsin has pointed out, the Federal Treasury is in pretty bad shape. The municipalities, the counties, and States, on the other hand, have plenty of money at the present time. While this may be an infant industry which needs encouraging, it seems to me that plans ought to be laid, and laid now, to pay for the construction of these airports.

The question along that line which I want to propound to the Senator is: What is the formula? What is the matching basis? Does the Federal Government pay all the cost, or does the State or the municipality pay part of it?

Mr. McCARRAN. The costs are paid dollar for dollar.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Dollar for dollar. And then the State or the municipality pays the maintenance.

Mr. McCARRAN. It must pay the maintenance. Whether it be the State or the municipality which obtains the grant, it must enter into an agreement with the Administrator to maintain the project, to take care of the upkeep.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. It seems to me that that provides the safeguard against the situations mentioned by the Senator from Connecticut of building airports where they are not needed, or where towns with small populations, for example, would not be able to match the Federal funds.

Mr. McCARRAN. I am not worried about that at all, because it simply could not be done under the provisions of this bill. There must be an agreement for the construction of a project, and there must be an agreement for its maintenance. Two agreements must be entered into by the sponsors. One is to construct, to put up dollar for dollar, and the other is to maintain after the project is constructed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is a very satisfactory reply. I should now like to have the Senator state what studies have been made, and the results of the studies, with respect to the aviation industry paying its own way. The aviation companies have a considerable amount of money. They have grown like mushrooms, perhaps due to war conditions. They have vast funds. The industry may be in its infancy, but many of the present companies are making sizable profits.

Mr. McCARRAN. I wish to leave this thought with the able Senator from Colorado. An airport is just what its name implies. It is a port. What do we do about the ports of entry? Does not the Federal Government aid in constructing ports of entry, in building berths for the ships to bring in the commerce of the world? The same principle applies to the construction of an airport. In other words, a large part of our commerce is going to be carried by air. Every community, if it is to be abreast of the times, will want to have its part in that commerce. Therefore, it is vitally essential

that it have an airport, where there can be landings and take-offs.

An airport is essential also from the standpoint of the protection of human life, as a link in the chain of safety of travel by air.

There must be standardized airports. Who is to standardize them? No one can do it better than the Federal Government. Then there will be one over-all standard for the landing places in the respective communities.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes, but if the Senator will pardon me, that does not go to the root of the question I am asking. Even though the Federal Government has a responsibility, the same thing applies to the building of highways. The Federal Government lays down standards respecting curves, elevations, grade separations, and other matters, but that whole program is paid for by a special tax on the motorists.

Mr. McCARRAN. The maintenance is paid by a special tax on the motorists, but does not the Federal Government put up its pro rata of the money in the first instance?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Every cent of money that the Federal Government puts up for highway construction has previously been collected from the motorists by a special tax.

Mr. McCARRAN. I do not know about it having been previously collected. That does not make any difference whatever.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the Senator will permit me, I think the Senator from Colorado is not quite correct in saying that every dollar put up by the Federal Government has been previously collected or provided by a special tax. The gasoline tax was not initiated for the purpose of helping to build highways. It was levied back in 1929 or 1930 to help raise about \$150,000,000 which we could not find anywhere else, to enable the Federal Government to pay its operating expenses. We began to contribute dollar for dollar under the program which was adopted in 1916 for Federal aid for highways, long before we levied either a gasoline tax or a motor tax. The gasoline and motor taxes go into the general fund of the Treasury, and out of the general fund we appropriate whatever we contribute for the building of highways.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am not interested in the bookkeeping features of the case; but it is a fact that more money is paid into the Federal Treasury by motorists in the form of special taxes than is paid out by the Federal Treasury for the improvement of highways. The Federal Government has a tremendous investment in highways.

Mr. BARKLEY. That may be. That money might be paid in even though the Federal Government were not making contributions for highway construction, because the taxes were levied for general purposes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The tax is levied, and goes into the Treasury, and appropriations come out of the Treasury. The Treasury is going to be in bad shape unless we put in as much as we take out. If we are going to take out money for

a special industry, such as the aviation industry, we ought to figure out some way of putting the money into the Treasury before we attempt to take it out.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. Did the Senator from Colorado say that the Treasury was going to be in bad shape?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The Treasury is in bad shape.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I assume that if \$100,000,000 is made available for airports the first year, there will be a demand for considerably more than \$100,000,000 almost immediately. Is there anything in the bill providing for the manner in which the money available shall be allocated to the various States, or is there any limit on the amount which may be allocated to any one State?

Mr. McCARRAN. The money is allocated on the basis of population and area.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. Section 16, on page 49, provides as follows:

SEC. 16. Whenever it is the opinion of the Administrator that any real or personal property or interest therein necessary in connection with a project under this act cannot be acquired by the State, or by the public agency sponsoring the project, without undue expense or delay, the Administrator may, at the request of such State or public agency, institute a proceeding for the condemnation of such property or interest therein in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to expedite the construction of public buildings and works outside of the District of Columbia by enabling possession and title of sites to be taken in advance of final judgment in proceedings for the acquisition thereof under the power of eminent domain", approved February 26, 1931 (U. S. C., 1940 edition, title 40, secs. 258a to 258e, inclusive), the entire cost of which acquisition shall be borne by the State or project sponsor out of the combined Federal and non-Federal funds available for such project. When so acquired by the United States, such property or interest therein shall be conveyed to the State supplying funds for its acquisition or to the public agency sponsoring the project, as may be appropriate.

Does not the Senator from Nevada think that it is a poor precedent for the Federal Government to constitute itself an agency to condemn property for the use of a municipality or State? Our condemnation laws were not enacted for that purpose, were they?

Mr. McCARRAN. The question raised by the Senator from Arizona was given careful study and consideration. I hope the Senator will read the language carefully, because it is highly important. It is found on page 49 of the bill:

Whenever it is the opinion of the Administrator that any real or personal property or interest therein necessary in connection with a project under this plan cannot be acquired by the State—

That is, when the State, as the sponsor, cannot acquire it for some reason or other—

or by the public agency sponsoring the project—

Which may be a city—

without undue expense or delay—

It will be recalled in that regard that the condemnation law was enacted so that we could take possession of property for the construction of highways even before a court had passed upon the question, and without putting up a bond.

Notice the following language:

The Administrator may, at the request of such State or public agency, institute a proceeding for the condemnation of such property—

In other words, the State must first request the Federal Government to step in and condemn.

Mr. McFARLAND. What does the Senator mean by the State? Does he mean the Governor of the State, or the people of the State, by a vote? The people of the State constitute the government. The State could enact a law which would implement this procedure. That is one thing. However, it is quite another thing if it means merely the judgment of some official.

The point I make is that this is very important legislation, and a very important—and I am afraid unfortunate—precedent is proposed in allowing the Federal Government to condemn property for the benefit of a State or municipality. The condemnation may involve a 15-story building which the people of a city and the people of a State refuse to provide means to condemn; yet it is proposed, whenever the Administrator considers it necessary, to have the Federal Government condemn the property which the State, or the officials of the State, refuse to condemn.

Mr. McCARRAN. But the State does not refuse to condemn. Will the Senator read the language again?

Mr. McFARLAND. I say they refuse to condemn because they do not set up the machinery whereby the property can be condemned.

Mr. McCARRAN. It is presumed that every State has its condemnation procedure. The language of the bill is as follows:

Whenever it is the opinion of the Administrator that any real or personal property or interest therein necessary in connection with a project under this act cannot be acquired by the State, or the public agency sponsoring the project, without undue expense or delay, the Administrator may, at the request of such State or public agency, institute a proceeding for the condemnation of such property.

He cannot move a hand until he is requested to do so—by whom? By the State, acting through its duly constituted authority, whether it be the people, the law, the Governor, or the head of the aviation commission in the State. The Administrator can act only upon request, and not otherwise. To my mind that is one of the safest methods which we have yet devised for acquiring property by condemnation.

It is absolutely essential that this great work go forward, and it is absolutely essential that there be some constituted authority to say when property shall be condemned for public use. If John

Smith owns a piece of ground which is necessary for such a project, and refuses to allow a great project to be undertaken by a municipality because he owns the ground, his property can be taken for public use.

Mr. McFARLAND. But the Senator will note that the language of the bill provides that the property shall be turned over to a third party. The Federal Government can condemn property for its own use anytime it wishes to do so; but what authority has the Federal Government to condemn property for the use of a municipality, and turn over the title to a municipality? The Federal Government should not be an agency to condemn property for the use of some other agency.

Mr. McCARRAN. It has the same authority which the State has, and the same authority which a municipality has. Either has the power of condemnation for public purposes.

Mr. McFARLAND. I am not complaining about the authority of a municipality or the authority of a State. What I am complaining about is the Federal Government condemning property for the use of some other agency.

Mr. McCARRAN. Let us take the other side of the picture. Suppose the Federal Government should step in and condemn certain property. The Federal Government would take title. Like myself, the Senator from Arizona has been complaining at the way in which the Federal Government has been acquiring realty all over the United States by condemnation and other proceedings. It was to head off that very thing that we wrote into this bill the provision that title to the property shall be conveyed to the sponsoring agency.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Is not the purpose of this provision of the bill to prevent any interest which might be opposed to the expansion of air transportation, or perhaps the location of an airport at a certain place, from acquiring a little piece of property and, under most of the State laws, being able to hold up the development of the airport for perhaps 2 or 3 years or more?

Mr. McCARRAN. Certainly. It is not necessary to mention the agencies which may be opposed to aviation, but anything could happen. Therefore, we tried to meet the situation as best we could.

Mr. AIKEN. It seems to me the committee was very wise in safeguarding the situation in that way.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, are there any other questions? If not, if there are now any amendments to be offered, they should be called up. I understood that the Senator from Maine wished to offer an amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will state that it will be necessary to offer amendments to the committee amendment before it is voted upon. Otherwise, if the committee amendment is adopted, it will not be in order subsequently to offer amendments to it without a reconsideration.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the bill now comes before the Senate in

amended form; it is entirely an amendment. I wish to invite the attention of the Senator from Maine to the fact that he stated he wished to offer an amendment. If we were to adopt the pending committee amendment at this time, I doubt very much whether the Senator could offer his amendment.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I appreciate very much the courtesy of the Senator from Nevada. I have amendments which have been printed, and which I think now lie on the desk. They cover several changes. I now offer them.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendments will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. The following amendments are proposed to the committee amendment:

On page 29 strike out lines 4 to 8, inclusive; and reletter succeeding subsections.

On page 31 strike out lines 5 to 10, inclusive; and reletter succeeding subsections.

On page 32, lines 16 and 17, strike out "their political subdivisions, and other non-Federal public agencies."

On page 32, beginning with the word "Such" in line 20, strike out down through and including the word "State" in line 3 on page 33, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "The State airport agency receiving a grant may use to match such grant any public."

On page 33, beginning with line 24, strike out down through the period in line 2 on page 34.

On page 35, beginning with line 20, strike out down through the period in line 2 on page 37.

On page 37, strike out lines 4 to 14, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "SEC. 7. (a) As soon as possible after the beginning of each fiscal year 65 percent of all Federal funds available for grants during that fiscal year shall be apportioned by the Administrator among the several State airport agencies, one-half in the proportion which the population of each State bears to the total population of all the States, and one-half in the proportion which the area of each State bears to the total area of all the States. All sums so apportioned for a State shall be available to pay the pro rata share of the United States of the allowable project costs of authorized projects for the development of class 3 and smaller airports in that State. The remaining 35 percent of the Federal funds available for grants during such fiscal year shall be apportioned to State airport agencies to pay the pro rata share of the United States of allowable project costs of such approved projects for the development of class 4 and larger airports in urban areas, as the Administrator may deem most appropriate for carrying out the National Airport Plan"; and renumber succeeding sections.

On page 38, line 5 strike out the words "or public agencies therein" and insert in lieu thereof the word "funds."

On page 38, in lines 9 and 10, strike out the comma and the words "and to public agencies."

On page 38, line 15, strike out the word "State."

On page 38, beginning with line 16, strike out down through the comma in line 19.

On page 40, strike out the words "or project sponsor" where such words appear in lines 1 and 24; and in line 15 strike out the comma and the words "or project sponsor, as the case may be."

On page 41, line 1, strike out the words "or project sponsor."

On page 41, lines 12 and 13, strike out "under either the State program or the urban program."

On page 42, lines 15 and 16, strike out "or project sponsor as the case may be."

On page 42, strike out the words "or project sponsor" where such words appear in lines 19 and 25.

On page 43, line 5, strike out the words "or project sponsor."

On page 45, line 1, strike out the words "or project sponsor."

On page 45, line 5, strike out the word "State" where it appears the first time.

On page 45 strike out lines 18 to 21, inclusive; and renumber succeeding subparagraphs.

On page 46, strike out the word "State" where it appears in lines 3 and 14, and where it appears for the second time in line 9.

On page 46, beginning with line 19, strike out down through and including line 4 on page 47.

On page 49, beginning with the word "Among" in line 5, strike out down through and including line 8 on page 50, and renumber succeeding sections.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair asks the Senator from Maine whether the amendments are correlated and are to be considered as one amendment. What is the desire and purpose of the Senator from Maine?

Mr. BREWSTER. I shall make that clear in my discussion of the matter. It is my thought that probably they should be divided, as they present several distinct issues. These proposals are rather comprehensive ones which have been urged by the Council of State Governments, and they were embraced in this blanket form simply for convenience. But I should contemplate that in their consideration they might well be acted upon separately.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will my colleague yield to me?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. Is the amendment as reported identical with the amendment as printed?

Mr. BREWSTER. Yes; it is the printed form which I have submitted.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question before the Senator from Maine proceeds.

Mr. BREWSTER. I shall be glad to have the Senator from Nevada do so.

Mr. McCARRAN. I think the Senator from Maine will agree that these very clauses or separate amendments, if they are to be called such, are all interdependent and interrelated.

Mr. BREWSTER. That is not quite true; some of them could be adopted without regard to the others.

The chief issue, as I think the Senator from Nevada understands, deals with the question whether in the allocation of the Federal funds the channeling shall be through a State agency or directly to a municipality. That is the fundamental issue. There are some related issues, and there will be some minor modifications requisite to carrying them out.

There is also the provision that the Federal agency shall not have the right of condemnation. That is not an essential part of this proposal, but it is related to it at least in principle.

In discussing the broad issues presented by the proposed legislation, I, along, I believe, with many other Members of the Senate, should wish to associate myself completely with the presentation of the Senator from Nevada as to the wisdom of our embarking upon a program of this character. To be sure, it is

a departure from what has hitherto been the practice, but I think the evidence before the committee and the overwhelming sentiment of the country recognize that in the postwar era airports and air navigation are to play something of the part which highway transport played in the last quarter of a century; that a vast expansion of our air facilities will not only be expected but will also be conducive to the reconversion to civilian activities upon which we rely for the preservation of our economic progress.

So, Mr. President, in anything which I may say I do not desire to indicate any reluctance to go on with the development of a Federal-aid program modeled very materially upon the Federal-aid highway program, with the success of which I think we are all familiar in the development of a highway system which has been the amazement of the world. While I would not wish to press the analogy too far, I think it is pertinent to remind ourselves that probably the success which we have achieved in this war is due in no small measure to the foresight and vision of those who 30 years ago outlined a highway program with Federal assistance which has resulted in bringing about a petroleum economy in the United States.

I say this from the observation of the past few years, following the time when the war burst upon us and the Axis Powers challenged us with their might. It was only the petroleum industry of the United States that enabled us to meet the onslaught. Britain and Russia, with petroleum resources equal to our own, lacked entirely the refining industries which could alone make the petroleum available. The result was that we contributed more than 80 percent of all the petroleum products used in the war. I do not believe that I need to labor the statement that the war which has only recently been brought to an end was a petroleum war. Without petroleum, our ships, planes, and tanks would not have been able to move. It was only the abounding refining resources of the United States that made it possible to meet the Axis onslaught. I make this statement as indicating that, while the fact to which I have referred was perhaps very little in the thoughts of the men who 30 years ago outlined the Federal-aid highway program, it was one of its most happy results.

In time to come air transportation will obviously play a very important part in the life of all nations. It is also obvious that we shall not be able to carry on an air program, so far as military arms are concerned, with anything like the capacity which we now have of producing from 50,000 to 100,000 planes a year for military purposes. That production will inevitably fall. It will be essential that the countries that are to speak with significance in the affairs of the future shall have enormous potentialities of airpower built upon a sound commercial base. America has long been air-minded. She has vast spaces in which air transportation could very abundantly serve. So the laying of a broad and deep foundation of commercial and private air development which shall continue the progress of an air-minded America will,

in my judgment, be found at the very base of our future authority among the nations of the world.

So, Mr. President, I am completely in accord with the purposes of the pending bill in seeking the allocation of Federal funds upon a Federal-aid basis—50-50 with the States—for laying the foundation of the policy to which I have referred. I separate from the provisions of the bill, however—

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I heard the Senator state that the basis was to be 50-50. I understand it is to be only 35 percent.

Mr. BREWSTER. I believe the Senator from Oklahoma has misunderstood. The 35-percent provision deals with the allocation of a \$100,000,000 fund each year which is to be put up for this purpose. Thirty-five percent of that fund is to go to urban areas for class 4 and 5 airports and 65 percent to the smaller airports of the 1, 2, and 3 class. All of this, however, is on a 50-50 basis.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, during the course of the discussion of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] and the Senator from Maine [Mr. Brewster] it was stated that 35 percent of the funds would go to the large airports. However, in a State in which there may be no class 4 and larger airports the entire amount would be allocated to such airports as are in the State, would it not?

Mr. BREWSTER. I do not understand that to be the provision of the measure at the present time. I believe the Senator from Nevada will correct me if I am wrong.

Mr. McCARRAN. I did not understand the statement.

Mr. BREWSTER. The question propounded by the Senator from Vermont was: whether or not, if a State did not have a class 4 or class 5 airport, it could get its share of the money for smaller airports. I have understood that there is no State without at least one class 4 airport.

Mr. McCARRAN. In any event, if the State wanted to construct a class 4 airport it could apply for Federal aid.

Mr. BREWSTER. The Senator from Vermont asked, if there were no class 4 or class 5 airports in a State could it get its share of money for the construction of smaller airports?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes.

Mr. AIKEN. The State would get 100 percent of the money to spend for such airports as were within the State if it had no class 4 or class 5 airports?

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct.

Mr. BREWSTER. Is the Senator clear about that provision of the bill? I thought the provision was clear that the money must be allocated for class 4 and class 5 airports.

Mr. McCARRAN. Thirty-five percent is allocated to the urban program; 65 percent is allocated to the State program, which has to do exclusively with airports of classes 1, 2, and 3. However, if the State wishes to build a class 4 airport it may apply in the same way as one of its subdivisions may apply.

Mr. AIKEN. The language of the bill is, I believe, "not more than 35 percent."

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct.

Mr. BREWSTER. I do not believe the Senator's answer was quite responsive. The question of the Senator from Vermont was to this effect. Suppose a State did not wish to build a class 4 or a class 5 airport, but wished instead to build a class 1, class 2, or class 3 airport. Could it take a 35-percent allocation and apply it on airports of classes 1, 2, and 3?

Mr. McCARRAN. I am not inclined to think that it could do so.

Mr. BREWSTER. That is what I had understood.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, if the Senator from Maine will yield, I believe that the language beginning in line 24 of section 5 on page 33 of the bill specifically answers the inquiry of the Senator from Vermont in the affirmative, namely, that the money could be so used.

Mr. AIKEN. Will the Senator from Massachusetts repeat the reference.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I refer to section 5, line 24, on page 33 of the bill.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes. That is my understanding, and that is why I wanted to make it clear that no State would be deprived of its money if it wished to put all the money into the construction of class 1, 2, and 3 airports instead of putting 35 percent of it into the construction of class 4 and 5 airports.

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Senator for the explanation. I thank all Senators who have participated in the explanation.

Mr. BREWSTER. I wish to resume the discussion of the fundamental issue involved as to whether or not the allocation of funds should be on a State basis rather than upon an urban basis as here proposed.

The council of State governments is very much concerned about this matter inasmuch as it represents, perhaps, another camel's nose under the tent in derogation of State responsibility. I think the legal situation is generally recognized that the cities are creatures of the State, and that they are subordinate to the State sovereignty. The whole success of the Federal highway program has been built upon Federal-State cooperation under which the State highway agencies of the various States have prepared their programs, have submitted them for Federal consideration, and have then carried them out if they met with Federal approval and were granted Federal funds. That was true no matter whether the highway was a comparatively modest one, serving a rural area, or whether it was a great arterial highway serving vast metropolitan centers. All expenditures of that character were channelled to the cities and the counties through the State agencies from the Federal Government. In a great measure the success of the great Federal highway program has resulted from such full cooperation of the State and Federal authority.

It is viewed with concern by many persons that there should be here proposed a departure from what seems to them to be a sound principle. As one familiar

with the functioning of this system and who has been a governor of a State, I may say that there never rose within my State any difficulty whatever as to the allocation of funds. It was worked out by the State among the several counties and municipalities, submitted to the Federal Government, and then the final decisions were reached. The amendments which are here proposed are designed to present squarely the issue as to whether or not, in the allocation of Federal funds for airport construction, the same sound principle should not prevail.

It has been suggested that the cities have been more active than has been State authority in the development of airports, and in that statement there is a measure of truth. It is also true that they were acting as instrumentalities of the State in the development of airports. It was only by the power given to them by the State, either in the appropriation of funds or in the issuing of bonds, which is also under the control, so far as I know, of State authority and the State constitution, that they have been able to secure the funds by which these developments have been made. I think that, exclusive, perhaps, of one or two of the larger metropolitan areas, no possible point of conflict could arise, and I think, so far as those particular situations are concerned, there need be no fear of the adequacy of the provision.

The most important problem is that of New York City, which, as indicated by the telegram presented here from the mayor of New York this morning, has been one of those chiefly concerned about this aspect. New York City has LaGuardia Airport, on which there has been expended in excess of \$40,000,000, very much of that amount in Federal funds. Now New York City is developing Idlewild, at an expense which originally estimated at between seventy-five and one hundred million dollars but which is now discussed on the basis of \$225,000,000 for one airport.

I appreciate the interest in aviation which is exhibited by New York City. I think it is very commendable, but I also think that New York City should not cherish the idea that it is the only place in the country which will need airport development. This is said in no derogation of their power or authority or interest in developing such airports as they choose, but when they come to this body and ask up to pay 50 percent of the cost of a \$200,000,000 airport it is my judgment that that would absorb for many years to come all the funds available under the 35-percent provision of the bill.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. I deem an interruption worth while at this point.

The last expression of the Senator is the reason for one provision in the bill; that is, the provision regarding the construction of airports of the fourth and fifth classes. Not only must the Administrator approve but it is provided in the bill that such projects must be approved also by Congress. In other words, the question of the allocation of Federal funds for the construction of airports

of those classes furnished the reason for the inclusion in the bill of the very provision which concerns the matter the Senator is dwelling on. We say in the bill they should come to the Appropriations Committees of Congress, and proceed in the regular channels.

Mr. BREWSTER. I appreciate the provision to which the Senator has referred, but I still think there is question of whether or not that will mitigate or increase our difficulties in the consideration of the complicated questions involved. We have been through that with river and harbor improvements, in connection with which we have arrived at the considered conclusion that the Federal authority should determine what is requisite and proper for allocation. If we then move into the field of having the Congress pass upon the construction of individual airports, it seems to me likely to prove to be a Pandora's box which must inevitably create difficulty.

My amendments, as the Senator perhaps recognizes, do away with that provision, in the interest of placing squarely upon the executive authority the responsibility for the development of an adequate airport program, in consultation with the various State authorities, thus following the sound and well-seasoned precedents of the State-Federal highway-aid program in the provisions which are proposed by the Council of State Governments, and on which they will ask the Senate to pass.

Aside from the one in New York, there are very few situations in which complications of any character would arise. I think the great majority of the State governments, the governors, and the various authorities of the States are overwhelming in support of preserving the relationship between the Federal and the State Governments which has prevailed throughout a century and a half, and which has been especially conspicuous in the operation of the Federal-State highway program, which is the nearest analogy in the consideration of the matter now before the Senate.

The questions pointed out by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] in connection with the Federal program present immediately the problem of what would be the attitude of the State governments and the very great desirability that the State authorities should have at least a major voice in the determination of airport development within the boundaries of the particular States. There may well be problems between municipalities, where the overshadowing existence of one great metropolitan center does not exist, as in New York City, where the States might well be consulted as to whether one or another municipality of comparable size and of perhaps comparable requirements should receive the development, recognizing that there will be limitations upon what it will be possible to do under the funds provided.

The idea that municipalities should come directly to Washington in order to secure developments within their boundaries seems to me to have been at the root of very many of the difficulties of the last decade, that it strikes at the very foundations of our entire concep-

tion of a Federal Government, and that anything which looks in this direction in the postwar period may well be examined with exceeding care before we discard the tested principles.

In operation of WPA and other agencies we took up Federal aid to municipalities, and I am sure most Senators will agree that in its operation it resulted in vast complications, in the competition between various cities, in the competition between State and Federal authorities, and that it will be most undesirable to open this Pandora's box in the provisions we are here establishing for great Federal aid to airports, which may well lead down through the decades, and be calculated to render a great service to the expansion not only of our facilities, but also to the development of great commercial enterprises in the air, which will mean airplane factories, which will mean an airplane industry, which will mean all the factors which are concerned with our future development. To have a variety of municipalities—all those which would be considered in connection with class 4 and 5 airports—coming here in a great struggle for the early consideration of their projects, with the inevitable confusion which must result, seems to me not calculated to serve the interests of the great purpose we have in view.

Therefore, Mr. President, I hope that as these amendments are considered there may well be thorough exploration in the action we may take, of whether or not we should not retain the well-tested principle of channeling this aid through the State government.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I am very much in favor of the objectives of the bill, but I wonder if we are going to have to vote on the bill today. I do not believe many of us were aware that the bill was coming up for action today. It seems to me it is so important that we should have overnight to study it. I certainly should like a little time, not for the purpose of finding flaws in the bill, but in order to make sure that it does what it should do.

For instance, there has been a little discussion of whether 35 percent of the amount allocated to a State would have to be spent on building class 4 airports, or larger. It seems to me that if the interpretation is that 35 percent is available only for class 4 or 5 airports, we might put the States in the same position in which we would place them if we required them to build four-lane highways when they needed only two-lane highways. I, for one, should prefer to have that matter absolutely straight in my mind before voting on the bill. I am in favor of the bill.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I do not know what the plan of the Senator from Nevada is, but several Senators have spoken to me in the hope that the bill might eventually go over until tomorrow before there was a final vote on the amendments, in order that we may clarify the various issues.

Mr. McCARRAN. I would be the last one in the world to attempt to crowd the bill through. I have no desire to crowd it through. I am familiar with the pro-

visions of the bill, and its provisions are very clear to me. We have worked many months on the bill. The committee has devoted months and months of study to it. Certainly I am not going to crowd the bill through in any way, because I think that would not be the best policy. However, I think we should consider the amendment and dispose of it, if the Senator is going to ask for a vote on it.

Mr. AIKEN. If the interpretation placed on the bill is that a State could spend 100 percent of the money coming to it on class 1, 2, or 3 airports, then it seems to me the amendment offered by the Senator from Maine would need a little revising, in order to make it fit in with that interpretation of the bill.

Mr. McCARRAN. There is no question that the State, as a sponsor requesting Federal aid from the Civil Aeronautics Authority, can apply all the Federal aid it receives to the building of class 1, 2, or 3 airports.

Mr. AIKEN. That is the entire 100 percent?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes.

Mr. AIKEN. That is the interpretation which I want placed on the bill.

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes; there is no question about that at all. On the other hand, the State could join with a municipality to build a class 4 airport or class 5 airport. The State all the way through is considered, but all the money is not channeled through the State. It goes direct from the Federal Government to the State in the case of class 1, 2, or 3 airports, or class 4 or 5 airports if the State goes into the building of class 4 or 5 airports, or it goes directly to the municipality. If the city in the Senator's State best able to sustain a class 5 airport were to apply to the Federal Government through the CAA for Federal assistance for the construction of such an airport, and did not want to have the money channeled through the State, if it wanted to control its own airport, if it proposed to raise the money for the airport, if it proposed to have absolute control over it, it could do so. It would not have to go to the State authority for the money at all.

Mr. AIKEN. I am satisfied with the Senator's interpretation of the allocation of the funds. However, if that interpretation is accepted by the Senate, then the amendment offered by the Senator from Maine should probably read:

The remaining 35 percent, or such part as may be required thereof, of the Federal funds available for grants during such fiscal year shall be apportioned to State airport agencies to pay the pro rata share of the United States of allowable project costs of such approved projects for the development of class 4 and larger airports in urban areas—

And so on. I should like to ask the Senator from Maine a question in regard to his amendment. Under his amendment would the Federal Government reach an agreement with the city and the money go through the State agency, or would the Federal Government have to reach an agreement with the State agency for the development of a class 4 or class 5 airport in a city?

Mr. BREWSTER. The latter is the case. There would have to be an agreement with the State agency, the State agency representing the city or the coun-

ty or any other public authorities within the area that may desire to construct the airport.

Mr. AIKEN. Then the Federal Government could not deal directly with a city?

Mr. BREWSTER. No.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is, under the Senator's amendment.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It would be wise to make clear to the Senator from Vermont that the amount which the Federal Government would put into a State is determined by the Federal Administrator. In other words, if the Federal Administrator determined that a certain number of dollars should go to Montpelier, Vt., the State agency could not upset that allotment, except to say whether any or all of it should go. It could not determine the amount. Am I not correct?

Mr. BREWSTER. That statement is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. As I understand from conversation with the Senator from Nevada, there is a formula for the allocation of funds based on area and population which would determine the amount available in any case.

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes.

Mr. BREWSTER. The provision is the same in both the bill and my amendment, that the allocation shall be "one-half in the proportion which the population of each State bears to the total population of all the States, and one-half in the proportion which the area of each State bears to the total area of all the States."

Mr. McCARRAN. I have not followed the Senator's discussion, so I cannot answer.

Mr. BREWSTER. Under my amendment, if a State does not want to use all the funds for class 1, 2, and 3 airports, it may put some of its 65 percent into class 4 or class 5, so as to get a very adequate airport. I do not understand that that would be possible under the bill as it is now written.

Mr. McCARRAN. Oh, yes.

Mr. BREWSTER. That represents a difference of interpretation.

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes, indeed.

Mr. BREWSTER. I understand that class 4 and 5 funds might go down to class 1, 2, and 3, but not that class 1, 2, and 3 funds could go up to class 4 and 5.

Mr. McCARRAN. Let me use my own State as an illustration. If the Senate of Nevada wanted to build a class 4 airport in the center of the State where perhaps there was no municipality to sustain it, there is nothing to prevent it from building such an airport if it can come to an agreement with the Federal Government about it.

Mr. BREWSTER. The funds allocated on the 65 percent-35 percent basis could go from the 65 percent for class 1, 2, and 3 over to the 35 percent for class 4 or 5. That is the point we are raising with the Senator from Vermont. Under my amendment it is made clear that that is possible, but under the bill I have some doubt.

Mr. McCARRAN. Under the bill it is not.

Mr. BREWSTER. That is correct. I am glad the Senator concurs.

Mr. AIKEN. Suppose an important link in the national airport system were located in a State so small and so thinly populated that it could not meet half the cost of such an airport, and furthermore had no particular need of it or could not derive the full benefit which it should in order to meet its half of the cost, is there any provision in the bill whereby the Federal Government can pay any greater amount toward that essential link with the national airport system?

Mr. McCARRAN. Greater than the 50 percent?

Mr. AIKEN. Yes; greater than the 50 Percent?

Mr. McCARRAN. No.

Mr. BREWSTER. I think the point which the Senator raises as to the flow of funds, under the election of the State between the different classes of airports, is an important one, and one that would be entirely consistent with the Federal principle that we allocate money for development, and if the airport is one which meets with the Federal program even though it is not of the category to which the 35 or 65 percent provision would apply, it might well be feasible for the transfer, by agreement between the Federal and State authorities. That is limited under the bill as it is now written.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator from Maine agree that under the interpretation of the allocation of funds as given by the Senator from Nevada the amendment proposed by the Senator from Maine should be revised to fit in with it?

Mr. BREWSTER. Yes. I think the Senator from Nevada agrees that the class 4 and 5 money could go down, but not that the class 1, 2, and 3 money could go up, which I myself think is pretty clear, but I believe it should be made more clear in connection with our consideration of the matter.

Mr. WILEY. Perhaps the Senators can get together on that point.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes. It seems to me it would be well to get together on that point.

Mr. BREWSTER. I should like to insert in the Record a letter reporting on the development of the Federal airport program showing that there was an absence of consultation between the Federal authority and the State authority, which I think is unfortunate.

This is a report filed by Sheldon B. Steers, president of the National Association of State Aviation Officials, with Mr. Frank Bane, executive director, Council of State Governments. I ask unanimous consent to have the report printed in the Record at this point as a part of my remarks, in order to show the absence of the coordination which in my judgment is most desirable.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

STATE OF MICHIGAN,
BOARD OF AERONAUTICS,
CAPITAL CITY AIRPORT,
Lansing, Mich., May 16, 1945.

MR. FRANK BANE,
Executive Director, Council of State Governments, Chicago, Ill.

DEAR FRANK: In accordance with our telephone conversation of recent date, I sent the

following night letter to 25 States, who have aeronautics commissions:

"To what extent did CAA study requirements of your communities and consult with your department prior to their promulgation of the national-airport plan. Were you asked or did you submit any data to United States Senate Committee on Commerce regarding State budgets for airport construction? Air mail me comprehensive reply.

"SHELDON B. STEERS,
"President, NASAO."

The following are excerpts from the replies, but I quote liberally from that of the State of Alabama because it is indicative of the short notice to both the CAA regional airport engineers and the State commissions of the need for that information. It further demonstrates the sketchiness of the information placed in the hands of the CAA officials in Washington, who developed the so-called national-airport plan.

ALABAMA

"Regarding the extent to which CAA studied the requirements of our communities and how much they consulted with us prior to the promulgation of the national-airport plan, the answer to your questions can be summed up in two words 'very little.'

"On Saturday, April 12, 1944, I was in the office of the district engineer, CAA, in Birmingham and while I was there he received a telephone call from the regional office in Atlanta advising him to have his details for the postwar airport program for Alabama and Mississippi ready to bring to Atlanta on the following Tuesday, April 18.

"Prior to this date Mr. Johnson, the district airport engineer, and I had discussed from time to time the need of getting together and formulating a plan based on what studies we had made separately or together of various Alabama communities, but no action had been taken and a large part of our State had yet to be covered. So we both felt we certainly would be given sufficient notice in advance as to when a survey should be completed.

"The result was that the best we could do was to take an old airport plan of the State, made by Rountree in 1939, and hurriedly attempt to revise it. This revision, taking the form of locating airports largely geographically in communities, it was felt, might be able to support them. In many cases no sites had been located and we did not even know whether the community would be interested in participating in the construction of an airport.

"Mr. Johnson was told at the time of the phone call that this was only to be a rough estimate to determine the approximate amount of money that would be needed for Alabama, should a Federal-aid airport plan be promulgated, and that ample time for further study and revision would be given before any definite locations or sums were made public. We were requested by the CAA not to make public any information regarding the program until it was assured.

"We agree with you heartily that this method of approach to the spending of a large amount of Federal, State, and municipal funds is absolutely unsound. The CAA has one engineer for the entire State of Alabama and a large part of Mississippi. Mississippi, having no aeronautics commission, it is necessary for the district engineer to make all surveys and estimates for airports in that State. In addition to that he has to approve all sites that we may select; the result being that we have had to wait weeks and sometimes months to catch up with the district engineer to secure the approval of a site. This is not to be taken as criticism of the CAA personnel involved, who have entirely too much territory to cover and whom I believe are acting on orders from Washington to the best of their ability, but our work here in Alabama, in trying to get sites approved so that estimates can be made, has been greatly slowed up by the above

process. So in our opinion, the so-called national airport plan is sketchy, to say the least.

"Sincerely yours,
"E. W. STANFORD,
"Director, Aviation Commission,
State of Alabama."

COLORADO

"Replying to yours of May 4, as far as I am able to ascertain, Joe Monroe, airport engineer for CAA for this district, made a sort of horseback survey as to the requirements for airports in this State, and upon that survey the CAA based its national airport plan for the State of Colorado. It has not been scientifically prepared and no real investigation has been made to ascertain the needs for this State or the several communities of this State. Our commission was not consulted.

"CLARENCE L. IRELAND,
"Chairman, State Aeronautics
Commission."

CONNECTICUT

"I find that on April 5, 1944, a letter was addressed to this office by E. Fletcher Ingals, district airport engineer for CAA, and a map of proposed airports sent for comments, suggestions, etc. I immediately made a study of the map, and on April 12 forwarded a communication to the district engineer offering criticisms and suggestions. A day or so later, however, I was informed that the plan had already gone to Washington, and our suggestions were not included by reason of the shortness of time.

"It has been my personal experience that the airport section in this region has been most cooperative, and I have found Mr. Ingals most capable and always willing to cooperate. I have no criticism of any kind relating to his office except that it is inadequately staffed for the territory it is supposed to cover.

"KENNETH H. RINGROSE,
"Acting Commissioner, Department
of Aeronautics, State of Connecticut."

IDAHO

"The CAA made a reasonably detailed study of airport requirements in Idaho and conferred frequently with me on the subject. We agreed on a recommendation which their district engineer forwarded to Washington, which covered 80 locations in the State.

"LEVERETT DAVIS,
"Former Aeronautics Commissioner,
State of Idaho."

IOWA

"You are advised that at no time since I have been secretary have we been contacted by any personnel of CAA other than those who are designating locations for airports in this State. Insofar as we are concerned, we wouldn't know that CAA exists insofar as any contacts with this office are concerned.

"DON C. JOHNSTON,
"Secretary, Iowa Aeronautics Commission."

KENTUCKY

"Plans so far for Kentucky have been a wild guess. I have had correspondence with Harold Neely and his regional airport man, Hogan, and they are ready to cooperate with us in formulating the sixth edition of the national airport plan. They admit that the fifth edition now existing was drawn out of the hat, but seemingly are ready to go along with us, at least, in formulating our State plan. We have had a lot of trouble here in the State with CAA overselling the people on the kind of airport they need; in a couple of instances with disastrous results.

"A. H. NEAR,
"Director of Airports, State of Kentucky."

LOUISIANA

A telegram was received stating that Mr. Adams was out of the office and unable to reply.

MAINE

Apparently the wire was misunderstood and was acknowledged to the effect that the commission would act upon same at their next meeting.

MARYLAND

"This commission has no information whatsoever in our files that would indicate prior study of requirements of Maryland communities by CAA for airport sites. In February 1944 the CAA district airport engineer submitted to this office a tentative list of airports, together with a request that a review be made by this Commission. We were advised, however, that this information had already been presented to the administration in Washington.

"We have recently attempted to justify some of the CAA proposed sites but find, upon inspection, the topography of the areas mentioned in the plan is such that no possible location suitable for an airport exists. This raises the question in our minds as to why such communities were mentioned as a proposed class II or III airport, even though a desirable airport location did not exist.

"WILLIAM MCK. REBER, JR.,
"Director, Maryland Aviation Commission."

MASSACHUSETTS

"The CAA airport engineer submitted the Massachusetts segment of the proposed national airport plan for my criticism and suggestions and gave me 2 days to do it. Certainly there was no more time allowed than enough to take a look at the maps, populations, and check with existing airports, both civil and military. Realizing the plan was a complete pipe dream, we have not thought it advisable to spend any money even for the purpose of checking it against the communities.

"ARTHUR H. TULLY, JR.,
"Director, Massachusetts Aeronautics Commission."

MINNESOTA

"We received in May of 1944 a telephone call from the district airport engineer stating he had received advice from his regional manager that a survey was to be made, and he wished to consult with us. About a week or 10 days later the district airport engineer came to our office, stating his report had to be sent in within the next few days. He was in possession of some form of confidential release, and we spent about 2 hours checking from some list he had against municipalities in the State of Minnesota that had shown some interest in airport development.

"That was our first and last direct or indirect contact with the national airport plan until we received a copy of the plan as it was released last fall by the CAA. If any studies were made by local municipalities I am not aware of such studies and the shortness of time precludes the possibility that any such study could have been made, although it must be said of the district airport engineer that he undoubtedly did the best he could from data available in his office.

"L. L. SCHROEDER,
"Commissioner, Department of Aeronautics, State of Minnesota."

MISSOURI

"Since receiving your wire I have discussed these matters with Paul V. Roberts, CAA airport engineer for this State. He has told me that at the time the Missouri plan was based on population figures, existing airport facilities, and a general plan to provide at least one airport in every county. The State of Missouri did not have an aviation department of any kind at that time.

"E. V. FRYHOFF,
"Aviation Development, Missouri
State Department of Resources and
Development."

NEBRASKA

"Retel understand national airport plan worked out by CAA generally without any

detailed conference with our commission, although it does include all projects recommended by our commission.

"MAX KIER,
"Chairman, Nebraska Aeronautics
Commission."

NEW HAMPSHIRE

"The extent of CAA study of our community airport requirements unknown. Our commission not consulted prior to promulgation of national airport plan. No contact whatsoever with United States Senate Committee on Commerce regarding State budget for airport construction.

"JAMES F. O'NEIL,
"Chairman, New Hampshire Aero-
nautics Commission."

NEW JERSEY

"Captain Wilson is out of the country at the present time on military assignment. Sorry.

"MERRY L. KIMBLE,
"Secretary to Director, New Jersey
Department of Aviation."

OHIO

"The CAA representatives cooperated with this Bureau in every regard in preparation of our publication 'An Airport Plan for Ohio' and from that cooperation prepared its recommendation for the national airport plan.

"ROGER A. VALENTINE,
"Secretary, Bureau of Aeronautics,
"State of Ohio."

OREGON

"I spent 1 day with Regional Airport Section in trying to determine what might be their logical plan when presented in that manner. Some changes were made in the original draft which eventually came out as the fifth revision of the national plan. Later, upon questioning the Airport Section on how they arrived at the various estimates allocated to each site location, I was advised that no physical survey had been made and estimates were based on what they thought could be accomplished under normal conditions. At that time this office was not asked, nor did we submit any data to the United States Senate Committee on Commerce regarding State budget for airport construction. At the present time we are engaged in developing our own State airport plan.

"LEO D. DEVANEY,
"Director, Oregon State
"Board of Aeronautics."

PENNSYLVANIA

"Replying to your telegram, to the best of my knowledge, CAA did little or no studying of the requirements of Pennsylvania communities in promulgating their national airport plan. I believe the plan was gotten up in about 48 to 72 hours, based on data in the Airport Division's files, much of which was obsolete. I believe it to be primarily a geographic airport plan with the average cost compiled on WPA experience with a substantial cushion on the liberal side for errors in calculation. After it was drawn up we had an opportunity of conferring on the plan although I don't know that there were any changes made in the CAA plan.

"I am satisfied the CAA plan was merely a compilation of a lot of figures in order to arrive at a total appropriation asked for, hoping subsequently to make a detailed study with the money so appropriated. I feel your idea of having \$5,000,000 immediately appropriated to be spent in coordination with the States on an individual community survey is sound and should be accomplished the balance of this year if possible. Pennsylvania is ready, able, and willing with \$3,725,000 for plans and construction for the next 2 years to be spent on a matching

dollar basis with the Federal Government and/or the local municipalities.

"WM. L. ANDERSON,
"Executive Director, Pennsylvania
"Aeronautics Commission."

RHODE ISLAND

"Reference your telegram May 5, this is to advise that to my knowledge no factual studies were made by CAA of community requirements prior to promulgation of national airport plan. Furthermore, we did not submit any data to the United States Senate Committee on Commerce regarding State budgets for airport construction.

"J. V. NORMANDIN,
"Acting Deputy Director, Department
of Public Works, State of Rhode
Island."

SOUTH CAROLINA

"The district engineer of CAA did frequently confer with us regarding our airport needs; however, all the planning and establishment of airport needs originated in this office. CAA has incorporated the South Carolina Aeronautics Commission airport plan in its national airport plan.

"DEXTER C. MARTIN,
"Director, South Carolina
"Aeronautics Commission."

SOUTH DAKOTA

"I wish to advise our department was not consulted by CAA in their study of airport requirements, if any, for communities of South Dakota.

"JOHN MOODY,
"Executive Secretary, South Dakota
"Aeronautics Commission."

TENNESSEE

"CAA representatives did consult with our department relative to national airport plan, but on short notice. CAA representatives were often cautioned regarding incompleteness of the plan.

"HERBERT FOX,
"Director, Tennessee Bureau
"of Aeronautics."

UTAH

"We thought we were fortunate in this region in view of the cooperation of the CAA airport representative, Mr. R. W. F. Schmidt, and we did meet with him endeavoring to assist in his preparation of the figures for the fifth revision of the national airport plan; however, we assumed that most of the proposed airports would be merely small fields smoothed off sufficiently for use in emergency, others with graveled landing strips, and where all-weather operation was desirable graveled strips with 50-foot width paved centers might be constructed. Judging from the figures in the fifth revision of the national airport plan, super de luxe air terminals type facilities were contemplated, and I don't know who prepared the cost estimates which have caused so much unfavorable criticism. Certainly we had no part in it.

"We are at the present time preparing our own State airport plan on a realistic factual basis.

"JOSEPH S. BERGIN,
"Director, Utah Aeronautics
"Commission."

VERMONT

"Having come into this office June 1, 1944, I cannot answer for what conferences may have preceded that date, however, through the summer and early fall I checked proposals in the national plan informally in various parts of the State, and it became evident that the reception of the plan was going to be rather cool in most places. We have had several snappy editorials which point up the absurdity of locating airports to the tune of \$150,000 to \$300,000 in spots populated only by game animals. The total proposed for Vermont involves an expenditure of \$12,867,000. Considering the annual State budget is from twelve to fourteen million, the

airport plan looks a little fantastic to the natives, even when parcelled over a 10-year period. The proposal of \$800,000 for a field at Brattleboro, population 10,000, has been one of our biggest problems to handle. If that is a ticket to air transportation the natives are willing to continue traveling by bicycle and "the surrey with the fringe on top."

"I have no criticism of the district airport engineer for CAA. I believe he has done an excellent job under many handicaps, but I don't believe he has been consulted with any more frequency than have the State officials in connection with the national airport plan. In other words, there is much to suggest that the national plan is the work of someone in Washington having convenient access to an atlas and a few topographic maps.

"EDWARD W. KNAPP,
"Aeronautics Inspector,
"State of Vermont."

VIRGINIA

"CAA airport engineers have cooperated fully with this office. However, it may be estimates were changed in Washington after our recommendations were made.

"ALLEN C. PERKINSSON,
"Director, Division of Aeronautics,
"Commonwealth of Virginia."

WEST VIRGINIA

"There was very little study by CAA of airport requirements of West Virginia communities although Mr. Scalla and Mr. Wesson did drop in this office one day for consultation thereon.

"HUBERT H. STARK,
"Administrative Officer,
"West Virginia Board of Aeronautics."

In all instances the second question as regards submission of any data direct to the United States Senate Committee on Commerce was negative.

It is my personal opinion that a national system of airports can be no more sound than the foundation upon which it rests, and that is a suitable and adequate national airport plan. Certainly, such a plan can only be promulgated by, first, making an analysis of all existing facilities and the airport needs of the communities and States. From this a forecast could then be made showing immediate needs and forecasting the requirements for the immediate postwar period. I firmly believe that this work must be done by the Federal officials working in conjunction with the appropriate authorities in the several States, and I think the Congress in considering appropriations for these purposes should take these factors into account and so make provision within the legislation.

Sincerely yours,
SHELDON B. STEERS,
President, National Association of
State Aviation Officials.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. As I understand, the bill would establish the over-all authorization on the part of the Federal Government to spend \$500,000,000 in the next 5 years for airport construction and reconstruction.

Mr. BREWSTER. Yes.

Mr. CHANDLER. Is an equal sum of money to be obtained from State governments, municipalities, and other sources of State operation?

Mr. BREWSTER. They must put up an equal amount.

Mr. CHANDLER. Who is to have priority within the State? Is there any established priority as between a State and a municipality?

Mr. BREWSTER. That is the question which we are now debating. Under the terms of the bill as written, 35 percent of the money would be allocated for what are called urban projects, namely, class 4 and class 5 airports, which are the large airports, with respect to which the Federal Administrator would deal directly with a municipality if he deemed it best, although the State might also come in if it so desired. Under my amendment the activity must be channeled through the State agency. The Federal agency must deal with the State agency, the State agency, in turn, dealing with municipalities. That is the issue with which we are faced.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, has the Senator concluded?

Mr. BREWSTER. Yes.

Mr. McCARRAN. I did not wish to interrupt the Senator.

Under the terms of the bill as it is now before the Senate, the State agency would not be called in if a municipality should enter into an agreement with the Federal Government to support and maintain a class 4 or class 5 airport.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. Why would it not be best at least to consult the over-all State agency undertaking to make plans for the State as a whole, before permitting municipal corporations to have airports which might destroy the whole pattern of development for the State? Presumably a State plan, carefully developed and having in mind the welfare of the whole State, ought to take precedence over the claims of any municipality. Why is there not such a provision in the bill?

Mr. McCARRAN. Because, first of all, up to date, to a considerable extent airports have been constructed by the municipalities. With rare exceptions, they have been constructed by the cities of the country. The New York airports, the Chicago airports, and many others might be mentioned. That is one reason why the cities wish to have the opportunity, when and if they desire to construct their own airports, to apply directly to the Federal Government and deal with the Federal Government, rather than having the projects channeled through the State. If they were handled through the State, political conditions might arise, as a result of which a city might be deprived of an airport for a considerable length of time. It is believed that cities should have the opportunity, if they agree to maintain class 4 or class 5 airports, to enter into an agreement with the Federal Government and be permitted to construct their own airports. That is the philosophy.

There are two philosophies. One is that the States should have all Federal moneys channeled through them, and should absolutely control the aviation life of every municipality within the State. That is the theory or philosophy, very briefly stated, of the Conference of Governors.

The other theory is that a municipality which, by reason of its taxable property, its population, and its general advancement, is capable of maintaining

an airport in keeping with the dignity of the municipality should have the opportunity of constructing its own airport and dealing directly with the Federal Government, obtaining aid from the Federal Government. The Senate can decide between those two philosophies. So far as I am concerned, my study of this subject leads me to the conclusion that the compromise effected in this bill after many months of study is the best way out. We say that the Federal Government shall allocate to the States 65 percent of what is appropriated by Congress. That is, we allocate it to the State program—not to the States but to the State program. The State program shall include construction of the smaller airports, namely, class 1, class 2, and class 3 airports. We say that 35 percent of the money appropriated by Congress shall be allocated to the urban program, or the municipal program. Why? Because we believe that each of the philosophies has merit.

In other words, we believe that it is entirely proper that the city of Cleveland, for example, should be permitted to say to the Federal Government, "We want to build our own airport. We do not want to be compelled to go to the State administration. We will maintain the airport. We have the taxable property to maintain it, and we can prove our ability to maintain it." Therefore the city would come to the Federal Government for aid, and the Federal Government would deal with the city of Cleveland.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. BURTON. The Senator has referred to the division as between the State program, representing the smaller airports, and the so-called urban program, representing the larger airports. As I understand the bill, it seems to me that the definition would be clearer if the first program were designated as the program for smaller airports, and the second program the program for larger airports, not necessarily in cities. As I understand, class 4 and class 5 airports do not have to be in municipalities, and are not necessarily in municipalities.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct; but the two programs are set up in the bill, and therefore I used those expressions.

Mr. BURTON. The point about which I wished to ask the Senator was this: As I understand the development of the program of airports, there has been the development of major airports, which are interstate in character; and also there has been the development of a great many smaller airports, in the nature of feeder facilities, which are local in character. I understand from the recommendation which comes from the Civil Aeronautics Administration that there is an advantage in having the larger airports in one class, and the smaller airports in a different class. The larger airports involve the Federal relationship with large interstate movements, while the smaller airports are distinctly local in character.

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senator has stated it clearly.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. The comment I wish to make is that we have been building airports under the pressure of war, and under the necessity of building airports in the larger cities, where the people were, and where war industries were located. Now, we are getting ready to establish a program for peace. In my opinion, we shall encounter difficulty if we do not take into account the relationship between the Federal and State governments, and establish such a relationship first. It is useless for the States to make long-range plans for peace, through their governors and the various State agencies and planning boards, if the Federal Government is to deal with every city and town in the country. While I admit the necessity for it during wartime, during peacetime it seems to me that there is no such necessity.

This is a tremendous program, calling for the expenditure of \$1,000,000,000 in 5 years. The Senate should carefully consider whether it wishes to have the Federal Government deal with municipalities in peace time, or whether we wish to establish a carefully thought out over-all State program which gives consideration to the needs of the State as a whole, and establish a definite relationship between the Federal Government and the States, rather than having the Federal Government deal with the States, and also with each little community in the country. I believe that such a plan would involve trouble, and perhaps disaster.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the Senator have the figures as to how much each State would obtain under this program?

Mr. McCARRAN. No; I have not. The formula is in the bill, but I have not figured it out.

Mr. FERGUSON. I note, for example, that the city of Detroit has announced that it has an appropriation of \$3,000,000 to match Federal funds. The proposed city airport is estimated to cost \$10,000,000. If the State of Michigan received \$3,000,000, as I have roughly figured it out the city would be entitled to only 35 percent of that amount.

Mr. McCARRAN. No. The 35 percent is an allocation which is made directly after the appropriation is made for the program as a whole. In other words, suppose we should appropriate \$100,000,000 for the ensuing year. Immediately the Administrator would allocate 35 percent of that to the urban program and 65 percent of it to the State program. Then as the urban program came on—as, for instance, the city in Michigan asked for Federal aid—if it was agreed upon, the Administrator would take it out of the allocation of 35 percent and would apply it to the city in Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. What I am getting at is that under the bill as proposed by the committee the city of Detroit would be able to put up funds to match Federal funds; is not that correct?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes, I take it that is true.

Mr. FERGUSON. If a certain amount of money were appropriated to the State of Michigan—an over-all fund—and if

the over-all fund then were divided between what are known as class 1, class 2, and class 3 airports and class 4 and class 5 airports—we shall take it for granted that the \$10,000,000 airport at the city of Detroit would be either a class 4 or a class 5 airport—only 35 percent of the fund which was appropriated to the State could possibly reach that Detroit airport; is that correct?

Mr. McCARRAN. No. I do not think the Senator grasps the significance of the bill. In other words, the Administrator will immediately divide between the urban program and the State program, giving the State program 65 percent of the money appropriated and the urban program 35 percent. The 65 percent and the 35 percent will remain in the custody of the Federal Government; but if a State were to call upon the Federal Government for aid in the construction of an airport, it would come out of the 65 percent. In other words, it would come out of that part of the 65 percent allocated to that particular State. Do I make that clear?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes. Let us take a municipal airport.

Mr. BREWSTER. That would be the case if the airport were a class 1, class 2, or class 3 airport.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct.

Mr. BREWSTER. For class 4 or class 5 airports it is not to be allocated on a State basis at all; is that correct?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes.

Mr. BREWSTER. The whole fund might be put into New York City if the Administrator agreed to have that done and thought it was wise.

Mr. McCARRAN. That could be done if the Administrator and the Congress agreed to have it done, because the Congress must also agree.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, am I to understand that if the city of Detroit needs an airport and if the city of New York needs an airport—and it has been stated that they desire \$200,000,000 for that purpose—the Congress then could give all the fund to the city of New York, and the city of Detroit would receive no part of the fund?

Mr. BREWSTER. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. Then, we would find ourselves in the position of having the cities bid against each other for the vote of Congress as to who would get the 35 percent.

Mr. BREWSTER. That is correct. The city which had the most votes in the House of Representatives probably would receive the funds; the vote in the House of Representatives probably would be decisive in the matter.

Mr. McCARRAN. Probably the same situation would be true in this House.

Mr. BREWSTER. Of course, here in the Senate all States are equal, both the large and the small. The device of thus removing the responsibility from the State seems to me to be the fundamental difficulty. I think it should all be allocated to the various States.

Let us consider New York State. In New York State there are Albany, Syracuse, Buffalo, Rochester, and other up-State cities which might well desire to secure class 4 or class 5 airports; but if the Federal Administrator decided that

all the money should go to New York City, they would be helpless; there would be nothing they could do.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Under the Senator's program, he would appropriate initially the entire sum of money on the basis of population and area, and then it would be the duty of the particular State to apportion the funds as between class 1, class 2, and class 3 airports and class 4 and class 5 airports; is that correct? The State would do the appropriating or apportioning; would it?

Mr. BREWSTER. Nothing could be done within the State without the approval and consideration of the State; that is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. As I read the amendment of the Senator from Maine, it would not come back to Congress to have it pass upon who was to get any amount of the fund—that is, whether a municipality was to get it or whether a class 2 or class 3 airport, which would be a State airport or perhaps a county airport, was to get it; is that correct?

Mr. BREWSTER. The Federal Administrator would still possess the power of allocation insofar as the 35 percent was concerned, but it would be essential that he secure the collaboration of the State agency concerned.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Under the amendment of the Senator from Maine there still would be a 35 percent amount going to municipalities for, let us say, class 4 and class 5 airports; is that correct?

Mr. BREWSTER. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. That ratio would be maintained under the Senator's amendment, would it not?

Mr. BREWSTER. That is correct. But we would give the States power to determine what airport, if any, should be developed.

Mr. FERGUSON. Under the Senator's amendment, do I correctly understand that if a municipality desired to build an airport, it would have to make its arrangement with the State government to match the Federal fund?

Mr. BREWSTER. Yes, exactly as in the case of Federal highways at the present time. The State agency would be the one which would actually make the arrangement.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield first to the Senator from Massachusetts, who has been on his feet for some time.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, the Senator from Nevada stated a few minutes ago that if the amendment of the Senator from Maine should be adopted the State agency could have the entire say as to whether the 35 percent went into the State of Nevada or not. As I understand the situation, the Administrator of the Federal agency could say, "If you do not want to put it into Reno, Nevada, then I will not put it into the State of Nevada at all." I understand that the Administrator will retain the

control as to the city into which the money shall go.

Mr. BREWSTER. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As I understand the situation, under the Senator's amendment that power of the Federal Administrator would not be handicapped. He could say, "We will put 35 percent into an airport at Reno, Nevada, this year." But if the State agency in Nevada were to say, "No; we do not want it in Reno, Nev.," then the Federal Administrator would retain the power to put it into an airport in Detroit, Mich., or New York City.

Mr. BREWSTER. That is my interpretation.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. So, in answer to the question of the Senator from Michigan, as I understand the situation, the Federal Administrator still will retain the power to put into an airport in the city of Detroit all or none or half of the \$35,000,000. But if the State's aeronautic commission were to say, "We do not want that money in Detroit," then the Federal Administrator could say, "Very well; I am going to take the 35 percent and put all of it into Reno, Nev., or all of it in New York City."

Mr. BREWSTER. I think that is made clear by section 7 (a) of my amendment on page 2, which states:

The remaining 35 percent of the Federal funds available for grants during such fiscal year shall be apportioned to State airport agencies to pay the pro rata share of the United States of allowable project costs of such approved projects for the development of class 4 and larger airports in urban areas, as the Administrator may deem most appropriate for carrying out the national airport plan.

I think that answers the Senator.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, let me say that we seem to have two interpretations of this matter from the same source. I understood the Senator from Nevada to say earlier in the discussion that any State would receive 100 percent of the amount which was coming to it anyway, and that if it did not have class 4 airports, it could spend that money on class 1, class 2, or class 3 airports. But from the recent discussion it appears that the 35 percent is to be allocated to class 4 or class 5 airports anywhere within the United States; and instead of having the State of Nevada say that the 35 percent shall be spent in Reno, the Federal Government could say, under this more recent interpretation, that none of it would be spent in Reno.

Mr. BREWSTER. I think that is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. That is the interpretation of the Secretary of the Navy. In that case the amendment covers the situation. I must admit that the interpretations become less clear as we go along.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. I have not had an opportunity to study the Senator's amendment, but does it deprive the Civil Aeronautics Authority of the right to locate the large airports?

Mr. BREWSTER. No.

Mr. OVERTON. Of course, they are to be used in transcontinental aviation.

It may be that it would be proper to locate a large airport in a very small municipality or on the outskirts of one.

Mr. BREWSTER. I believe the Senator has not read the amendment which I submitted.

Mr. OVERTON. No; I have not had the opportunity of reading it.

Mr. BREWSTER. It expressly reserves to the Administrator the final responsibility of determining whether any airport shall be constructed. The exact language of the amendment is, "as the Administrator may deem most appropriate for carrying out the national airport plan." So in the final analysis the Federal Administrator has full determination as to whether Federal funds shall be used in connection with any airport, be it large or small.

Mr. OVERTON. Or in any State.

Mr. BREWSTER. I would not say that because, so far as the smaller airports are concerned, the money for their construction must be allocated on a population and area basis. If the State and Federal Administrator could not agree on any airports within a State, they would lose the use of all the fund, but I hardly think we could anticipate such an eventuality because it would probably be beyond reason. However, so far as the larger airports are concerned, it must be a matter of fitting them into the Federal airport plan.

Mr. OVERTON. Then, the CAA Administrator could prohibit the allocation of any funds for a class 4 or a larger airport in any State.

Mr. BREWSTER. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I wish to propound a question to the Senator. As I understand, under the pending bill 65 percent of the funds which may be allocated would go to the class 1, 2, and 3 airports, involving a so-called State program. Thirty-five percent would go to the class 4 and 5 airports, which are supposed to be embraced in the municipal programs.

Not merely in connection with the war, but prior to the war, communities of large size and importance, which had an interstate connection, and which were seeking to have interstate air lines establish facilities, were busy trying to prepare for the building of airports. Take my own State as an example. The city of Paducah, which is my home; the city of Louisville, which is the largest city in the State; and the cities of Covington, Newport, and Ashland are all working on local municipal airport projects with the view to increasing the interstate facilities for air travel. As soon as the facilities are located, those interstate airlines will begin stopping at those places and engaging in interstate commerce. If those towns and cities which are entitled, under the bill in its present form, to 35 percent of this fund are able to work out programs by which they can build airports, and draw to their communities air travel, they may do so under this bill. But notwithstanding the ability and willingness of the cities to which I have referred to inaugurate and consummate their own airport program through cooperation of the Federal Government, if the Senator's

amendment were agreed to and the Governor or State authority should so decide, those cities which are able and willing to develop their own airports might be denied any funds by the Federal Government to be used in the program. Is that not true?

Mr. BREWSTER. Yes. It recognizes the same principle that has prevailed always in connection with the Federal-aid highway program.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not think it presents an analogous situation. The State highway system has from the very beginning—years ago I had something to do with legislation to inaugurate Federal-aid highways—had for its purpose, of course, the building of State highways and the inauguration of a system of county-seat highways for the use of farmers and travelers generally. The proposed program of air travel seems to me to be more interstate than intrastate. The great travel lines by air are interstate. Every town on a river, or near a State line, if it is of sufficient size to justify air travel, desires to hook up with an interstate airline. It does not seem to me that the building of airports, the cost of which is necessarily limited as compared to the cost of building highways, should be placed particularly upon a State-wide basis. We cannot put air travel into an air-tight compartment bounded by the State lines of any State. The greater part of air travel is interstate in character. It seems to me that when a city is sufficiently important, or its location lends itself to the development of air lines which are national in scope, and the city is willing to tax itself, as my city has done already, it should be allowed to develop its own program.

The legislature of my State created a State aeronautical board at its last session, and the Governor of the State appointed six members on the board. Because they became involved in a disagreement as to policy, the other day the Governor fired them all. They were his own appointees, and he kicked them out the window unceremoniously. Of course, he has the power to replace them with others who will be more amenable, and who will agree with him.

Mr. BREWSTER. I believe I have heard of such things happening in Washington.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am not impressed with the analogy to which the Senator refers as existing between the construction of State highway systems and the construction of airports which are more related to interstate commerce traffic, it seems to me, than they are to intrastate traffic. I am very favorable to the development of intrastate air traffic. We are making an effort along that line in my State, and other States are doing the same. I do not think a highway system or any other particular system can be put on all-fours with the air-line and airport development to which we are now giving our attention.

I think it would be most unfortunate for any town or city, whether it be Detroit, Louisville, Cleveland, St. Louis, or any other important place which was willing and able to go forward with an airport program for itself, to be told by

the State authority, "You are able and willing to do that, but we will not let you have any funds out of the 35-percent allocations." That might be the result of the Senator's amendment.

Mr. BREWSTER. I should like to comment upon the statement of the Senator from Kentucky whose views I naturally respect. I believe that his characterization of the State highway and Federal-aid program referred to the early inception of it. I have no doubt that, as the result of the long experience of the Senator from Kentucky here in the Senate, he has overlooked the fact that while in the early stages the program was on a county basis, that basis was very quickly overrun. In recent years, at least during the past 2 decades, the whole emphasis has been on the development of Nation-wide highways, and we have route 1, running from Maine to Florida. We have other routes running through various sections of the country. There is the great Lincoln Highway running through Kentucky to the west coast. The whole emphasis of the Federal program has been placed on the development of great interstate highways.

Mr. BARKLEY. In my State we have been discussing for the past 2 or 3 years a construction program for superhighways within the State, but we have not yet begun it.

Mr. BREWSTER. Federal-State aid to highways has been developed, and during the past 20 years, as I have had occasion to know, the great Federal routes numbering from 1 to 100 are entirely Federal highways as distinct from intrastate highways.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. In presenting the typical case of Kentucky, referring to the three cities therein which have plans for the larger type airports, and raising the objection that under the proposed amendment a dozen other State agencies of his State might prohibit the construction of those airports and not use the funds therefor, I am wondering if the senior Senator from Kentucky has fully considered what would happen under the bill if it be not amended. Under the bill as it stands there is no requirement that any money whatever be expended in his State or any other State, so far as the 35-percent allocation is concerned. That allocation is made by the Federal Government without respect to any apportionment among States. Under the amendment it is initially apportioned to States, and if they do not use it within a year, it may revert to the Treasury. That is my understanding of the amendment as it stands. All the money is apportioned to States.

Mr. BREWSTER. No.

Mr. CORDON. I should like to be corrected if my statement is wrong.

Mr. BREWSTER. If the Senator will look on page 2 of the amendment, under allocations, he will see that the 65 percent is apportioned to the several States on the basis of population and area. The remaining 35 percent of the Federal fund available for grants during the

years is to be apportioned to State airport agencies to pay the pro rata share of the United States as the Administrator may deem most appropriate for carrying out the national airport plan. So that the Federal authorities still retain the right of allocation among the several States, recognizing that in the construction of the larger airports, as mentioned here, for Michigan, for instance, to cost \$10,000,000, the funds will not be adequate to the care of more than a few of the larger airports during that period, and the amount of the funds will determine the work to be done.

Mr. CORDON. If that be the purpose of the amendment, and if the amendment be adopted, the Administrator of the Civil Aeronautics Authority will still retain the right to allocate the 35 percent in toto to one airport, if in his discretion that is preferable, and will be in the interest of a national airport plan.

Mr. BREWSTER. That is possible.

Mr. BURTON. But, as has been repeatedly pointed out, subject to the authorization of the Congress.

Mr. CORDON. That authorization is necessary only under the original bill, and not under the amendment, as I understand.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maine yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. Presumably we are undertaking to establish a national airport program. We are going to establish one that will be just and fair, we hope, to all the people of the country. It seems to me that unless we establish it by making direct contact with the States, we will invite failure at the start.

I find myself in sharp disagreement with my colleague on that point. There might have been some excuse in wartime, when we were all under pressure, to have large cities which needed airports in a hurry rush in and not go to the States, because the States did not have a program, not having foreseen the emergency. But now we are planning for peace. There is no emergency or urgency, except to establish a sensible and sound airport program for the United States and for its people.

In my opinion there will happen what happened to the city of Cincinnati. The people failed to vote a bond issue, and the airport which had been planned for was built in my county in Kentucky, Boone County. That was merely because the city of Cincinnati failed to vote a bond issue.

It seems to me that the Senate, in undertaking to arrange for the expenditure of a billion dollars over a period of 5 years, which will afford some employment, and will result in the building of new airports and the reconditioning of old airports, should first require each State to make for itself a sensible airport program, before the Government goes into it at all.

Presumably the elected Governor of a State and the officials are duty bound to find where in all the State an airport presently located needs repairs, and where one should be built in the future for the benefit of the people.

I repeat, any other plan would have the cities, with their organizations, com-

ing to Washington and buttonholing all the officials, trying to get projects of their own, a selfish proposition, and not in the interest of the whole people. The Congress should provide for an unselfish program, which, in the opinion of all concerned, after certain plans were made, would definitely establish an airport program for the people of the United States which, in justice to all of them, would best serve the wishes and needs of the people of this country.

For these reasons I shall support the amendment offered by the Senator from Maine.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I have prepared a statement of the effect of the amendment proposed by the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER]. I ask unanimous consent that the statement may be printed at this point in the RECORD so that the Members of the Senate may have an opportunity to read it during the recess of the Senate.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This amendment would eliminate all participation in the airport program by municipalities or other political subdivisions of States, except to the extent that a State airport agency might be willing to act for and on behalf of a municipality or other political subdivision.

It eliminates the requirement that a State shall have adequate legislation to enable its political subdivisions to participate in the benefits of the program.

It eliminates the provision for congressional review of allotments for the construction of class 4 and larger airports."

It limits the amount which may be spent on class 3 and smaller airports to 65 percent of total funds appropriated, whereas the bill as reported makes this the minimum percentage to be expended on smaller airports and leaves the way open for expenditure of a larger proportion of appropriated funds on such airports.

It eliminates the legislative yardstick to guide selection of the class 4 and larger projects to which funds are to be allotted and leaves the selection of such projects wholly discretionary with the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics.

It provides for allocation of funds only to State airport agencies. A State which does not have a State airport agency would have to take legislative action to create such an agency before it could participate in the program.

By restricting project sponsorship to State airport agencies, this amendment would make it impossible for a Federal agency to sponsor a project, and therefore would operate to eliminate any project on Federal reservations, such as national parks or national forests.

The amendment eliminates the prohibition against diversion of revenue from aviation taxes to nonaviation uses, and in this respect departs from the precedent set in the Federal-Aid Highway Act.

It eliminates the authority of the Administrator to enter into enforceable contracts with States for the purpose of insuring compliance with project sponsorship requirements.

It eliminates authority for Federal condemnation of land for airports, when such condemnation is requested by the project sponsor.

Finally, it would limit the construction of class 4 and larger airports to urban areas.

VISIT TO THE SENATE OF GEN. JONATHAN MAYHEW WAINWRIGHT

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in view of the approaching visit of General

Wainwright, distinguished military hero, perhaps we should suspend consideration of the pending bill and have a quorum call so that all Senators may be present. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Gurney	Murray
Andrews	Hart	O'Daniel
Bailey	Hatch	O'Mahoney
Ball	Hayden	Overton
Barkley	Hickenlooper	Radcliffe
Bilbo	Hill	Reed
Brewster	Hoey	Revercomb
Briggs	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Brooks	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Buck	Kilgore	Saltonstall
Burton	Knowland	Smith
Byrd	La Follette	Stewart
Capper	Lucas	Taft
Carville	McCarran	Taylor
Chandler	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Connally	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Cordon	McKellar	Tunnell
Donnell	McMahon	Vandenberg
Downey	Magnuson	Wagner
Ellender	Maybank	Walsh
Ferguson	Mead	Wherry
Fulbright	Millikin	White
George	Moore	Wiley
Gerry	Morse	Young
Guffey	Murdoch	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-four Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, in a few moments the Senate will do honor to a great American general, and it is right that it should. But the Senate also does honor to my own State in paying General Wainwright the honor he so richly deserves. General Wainwright is a resident of the State of Washington. He was born in the southeastern corner of the State, in a town called Walla Walla, and still maintains his residence in the State of Washington.

I can say to my colleagues in the Senate that the people of that State today join with the entire Nation in paying this tribute of honor to their native son and one of the great heroes of this war.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, after conferring with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] and other Senators, it is desired that following the ceremonies of the reception to General Wainwright, the Senate recess until tomorrow and not resume consideration of the pending bill until tomorrow. Therefore, it is my purpose to ask that as soon as the Wainwright ceremonies are concluded the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock tomorrow.

In the meantime, however, I ask unanimous consent that the Chair appoint a committee of five Senators to wait on General Wainwright and to accompany him into the Chamber. It is my understanding, subject to General Wainwright's wishes, that he may make some brief remarks to the Senate upon his arrival in the Senate Chamber, following which he will take his place in front of the desk in order to give to Senators an opportunity to shake hands with him and to greet him in person.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. May the Chair make a suggestion to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. BARKLEY. Certainly.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Would the Senator from Kentucky object to

making the membership of the committee six?

Mr. BARKLEY. Certainly not.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair suggests the inclusion of the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] who represents General Wainwright's home State.

Mr. BARKLEY. I amend my request to that extent, Mr. President. I thank the President pro tempore for his suggestion.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair appoints as the committee of Senators to escort General Wainwright into the Senate Chamber the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON].

CONFIRMATION OF NOMINATIONS TO FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION BOARD

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I am reminded of the fact that there are two nominations on the Executive Calendar, those of Leo T. Crowley, of Wisconsin, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and Phillips Lee Goldsborough, of Maryland, to be a member of the same board. Inasmuch as their terms have expired, I ask unanimous consent, as in executive session, that the two nominations may be considered and acted upon. They are both reappointments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the two nominations on the Executive Calendar? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will state the nominations.

The Chief Clerk read the nominations of Leo T. Crowley of Wisconsin, and Phillips Lee Goldsborough, of Maryland, each to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation for a term of 6 years from September 6, 1945.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, as in executive session, the two nominations are confirmed, and, without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Oscar Henry Doyle, of South Carolina, to be United States attorney for the western district of South Carolina; and

Claude N. Sapp, of South Carolina, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of South Carolina.

Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Vice Adm. Louis E. Denfeld, United States Navy, to be Chief of the Bureau of Naval Personnel and Chief of Naval Personnel, for a term of 4 years, effective from the 15th day of September 1945; and

Brig. Gen. Archie F. Howard to be a major general in the Marine Corps for temporary service from the 26th day of July 1945.

CLAIMS CONVENTION WITH NORWAY—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY FROM CONVENTION

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the injunction of secrecy be removed from Executive G, Seventy-ninth Congress, 1st session, the Convention between the United States of America and Norway, signed at Washington on March 28, 1940, providing for the disposition of a claim of the government of Norway against the government of the United States on behalf of Christoffer Hannevig, a Norwegian subject, and a claim of the government of the United States against the government of Norway on behalf of the late George R. Jones, an American citizen.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the injunction of secrecy will be removed from the convention and it will be published in the Record.

The convention is as follows:

CONVENTION BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND NORWAY SIGNED MARCH 28, 1940

Whereas the Government of Norway has made claim against the Government of the United States of America on account of damages alleged to have been sustained by Christoffer Hannevig as the result of acts of the Government of the United States of America, the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation, their officers and agents, in relation to certain properties in the United States of America in which he claims to have had an interest, the validity of which claim is denied by the Government of the United States of America.

Whereas the Government of the United States of America has made claim against the Government of Norway on account of alleged denial of justice by the courts of that country in connection with certain litigation involving the rights and interests of the George R. Jones Company, or the late George R. Jones, the validity of which claim is denied by the Government of Norway.

Whereas the President of the United States of America and His Majesty the King of Norway, desirous of reaching an amicable agreement for the disposition of such claims and of concluding a convention for that purpose, have named as their plenipotentiaries, that is to say:

The President of the United States of America:

Cordell Hull, Secretary of State of the United States of America; and

His Majesty the King of Norway:

Wilhelm Munthe Morgenstjerne, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of Norway to the United States of America;

Who, having communicated to each other their respective full powers, found in good and due form, have agreed upon the following articles:

ARTICLE I

First. Within one year from the date of the exchange of ratifications of this convention, the Agent for the Government of Norway shall present to the Agent for the Government of the United States of America a Memorial or a statement of claim in which shall be set forth in a clear, categorical and full manner:

(a) the precise items of alleged loss or damage composing the claim on behalf of

Christoffer Hannevig as they are finally conceived to be by the Government of Norway, indicating definitely the amount of each separate item thereof;

(b) the facts alleged in support of each such item of the claim;

(c) the principles of law upon which each item of the claim is alleged to rest.

Such Memorial shall be accompanied by all the evidence upon which all items of the claim are made to rest, it being clearly understood that no further evidence may be submitted in support of the claim, either during the stage hereinafter provided for its diplomatic consideration or during its possible adjudication, except such rebuttal evidence as is referred to hereinafter.

Second. Within one year from the date of the receipt by the Agent for the Government of the United States of America of the Memorial of the Government of Norway, he shall present to the Agent for the latter an Answer to the Memorial, in which shall be set out, in a similarly clear, categorical and full manner:

(a) the defenses of the Government of the United States of America to each item of the claim;

(b) the facts upon which such defenses rest;

(c) the principles of law relied upon in each instance.

To such Answer there shall be attached all of the evidence upon which the defense of the case shall be made to rest and no further evidence shall be filed in defense, either during the stage of diplomatic consideration or during a possible adjudication of the claim, except such rebuttal evidence as is referred to hereinafter.

Third. Within six months from the date of the receipt of the Answer of the Government of the United States of America, the Agent for the Government of Norway may, if he so desires, file a Reply to such Answer. In such Reply the Government of Norway, without being allowed to augment or change any of the bases of the claim as stated in its Memorial, may explain such alleged bases in the light of the evidence filed with the Answer.

There may be filed with the Reply only such evidence as is strictly in rebuttal to evidence filed with the Answer and as does not present any new bases of claim. Any such evidence filed which is not strictly in rebuttal to the evidence filed with the Answer shall be entirely disregarded in deciding the case.

Fourth. Within six months from the date of the receipt of the Reply of the Government of Norway, the Agent for the Government of the United States of America may, if he so desires, file a Counter-Reply, which Counter-Reply shall be strictly limited to answering contentions advanced in the Reply.

There may be filed with the Counter-Reply only such evidence as is strictly in rebuttal to evidence filed with the Reply. Any such evidence filed which is not strictly in rebuttal to the evidence filed with the Reply shall be entirely disregarded in deciding the case. It is understood that no evidence may thereafter be submitted in support of or in defense of the claim, either during the period of its diplomatic consideration or during its possible adjudication.

Fifth. Within six months from the date of the receipt of the Counter-Reply of the Government of the United States of America, the Agent for the Government of Norway shall file with the Agent for the Government of the United States of America a legal Brief in which the Claimant Government shall set forth with clarity and fullness all its contentions with respect to the factual bases of the claim as already developed and the law applicable thereto.

Sixth. Within six months from the date of the receipt of the Brief of the Government of Norway, the Agent for the Government of the United States of America shall file with the Agent for the Government of Norway a

Reply Brief in which the Respondent Government shall set forth with clarity and fullness all its contentions with respect to the factual defenses of the claim and the law applicable thereto.

It is declared to be the purpose of this Article to require a full, systematic and fair development of all the facts and law of the case for consideration by the two Governments and, if necessary, by the tribunal or tribunals.

ARTICLE II

In the event that the two Governments shall be unable to agree upon a disposition of the claim, or any portions thereof, within the six months next succeeding the filing of the Reply Brief of the Government of the United States of America, the pleadings thus exchanged shall be referred to the Court of Claims of the United States of America for a decision on the claim or any such unsettled portions thereof, it being clearly understood, however, that in no event shall the issues of the case, either factual or legal, or the contentions of either party, as submitted to diplomatic discussion, be changed in character, or the written record above described augmented in any manner in the event that the claim shall be so referred to the Court of Claims for adjudication.

It is understood that the provisions for possible reference of the case to the Court of Claims, and for possible appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States of America, as provided in Article V hereof, are subject to authorization by the Congress of the United States of America.

ARTICLE III

The issues to be decided by the Court of Claims shall be those formulated by the pleadings exchanged pursuant to Article I of this convention, or such of those issues as shall not have been previously settled by agreement of the two Governments.

The Court of Claims shall decide such issues in conformity with applicable law, including international law, and shall state fully the reasons for its decision.

ARTICLE IV

As soon as possible after the receipt of the above-mentioned pleadings by the Court of Claims, the Court shall convene for the purpose of hearing such oral arguments by Agents or Counsel or both for each Government as the respective Agents thereof shall desire to present. The conduct of the oral proceedings shall otherwise be under the control of the Court.

ARTICLE V

Within three months following the date of the decision of the Court of Claims (in the event the case shall be referred to the Court for adjudication), either or both Governments may petition the Supreme Court of the United States of America to review the decision and such review shall comprehend either the factual or the legal bases of the case, or both, as may be requested in the petition or petitions.

ARTICLE VI

In the absence of such a petition to the Supreme Court the decision of the Court of Claims shall be accepted by both Governments as a final and binding disposition of the case. In the event of such a petition to the Supreme Court its decision shall be accepted by the two Governments as a final disposition of the case.

ARTICLE VII

In the event that an award is finally rendered in favor of the Government of Norway, no part thereof shall be paid or credited to that Government for any purpose whatsoever until the claims of creditors of Christoffer Hannevig and of his various American corporations shall have been settled by an agreement between the two Governments.

ARTICLE VIII

The language of the pleadings and of the oral proceedings shall be English. Any evidence submitted in any language other than English shall be accompanied by a full and correct translation thereof into the English language.

ARTICLE IX

The two Governments agree that the claim of the Government of the United States of America against the Government of Norway on behalf of the George R. Jones Company, the late George R. Jones, or his heirs, successors or assigns shall be developed for consideration in the following manner:

(a) the pleadings shall be limited to four in number, namely, a Memorial, an Answer, a Brief, and a Reply Brief, and they shall be prepared in the same manner, and filed within the same time limits as the corresponding pleadings provided for in Article I of this convention;

(b) all evidence in support of and in defense of the claim shall be filed with the Memorial and with the Answer in the manner prescribed in Article I, and no further evidence shall be filed except that such evidence may be filed with the Brief as is strictly in rebuttal to that filed with the Answer.

ARTICLE X

If the two Governments shall be unable to agree upon the settlement of the Jones case within the six months next succeeding the date upon which the Reply Brief shall have been filed in that case, the pleadings shall be referred by means of a joint communication of the two Agents, to a sole Arbitrator for decision. The Arbitrator, who shall be agreed upon by the two Governments, shall be a jurist of high reputation, well versed in international law, and shall be a national of neither Norway nor the United States of America.

In the event of the inability of the two Governments to agree upon an Arbitrator within two months from the termination of the period last above mentioned, such Arbitrator shall be selected by His Majesty the King of Great Britain, Ireland and the British Dominions beyond the Seas, Emperor of India.

The place of arbitration of the Jones case (in the event that arbitration becomes necessary) shall not be within the territorial jurisdiction of either of the contracting parties.

In the matter of the conduct of oral proceedings, the Arbitrator shall be bound by the principles of Article IV of this convention. The decision of the Arbitrator, which shall be rendered within three months from the conclusion of oral proceedings, shall be accepted by the two Governments as a final and conclusive disposition of the Jones case.

ARTICLE XI

Each Government shall pay all expenses incident to the preparation and presentation of its own side of each case. All joint expenses, including the honorarium for the Arbitrator, shall be borne by the two Governments in equal proportions.

ARTICLE XII

The periods of time mentioned in Articles I and IX of this convention may be extended by mutual agreement of the two Governments.

ARTICLE XIII

This convention shall be ratified by the High Contracting Parties and shall take effect immediately upon the exchange of ratifications which shall take place at Washington as soon as possible.

In witness whereof, the respective plenipotentiaries have signed this convention and have hereunto affixed their seals.

Done in duplicate at Washington, this twenty-eighth day of March, 1940.

[SEAL]

CORDELL HULL.

[SEAL]

W. MUNTHE MORGENSTIERNE.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now stand in recess, and that following the ceremonies incident to the reception of General Wainwright, the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

There being no objection, the Senate (at 2 o'clock and 58 minutes p. m.) stood in recess.

RECEPTION TO GENERAL WAINWRIGHT

During the recess, General Jonathan M. Wainwright, escorted by the committee appointed by the President pro tempore, consisting of Mr. BARKLEY, Mr. WHITE, Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. VANDENBERG, Mr. THOMAS of Utah, and Mr. MAGNUSON, and accompanied by Brig. Gen. Lewis C. Beebe, Lt. Col. John R. Pugh, Maj. Thomas Dooley, Technical Sgt. Herbert Carroll, Comdr. Jonathan M. Wainwright 5th, and Col. S. L. Huff, General MacArthur's representative, preceded by the Sergeant-at-Arms of the Senate (Wall Dooey) and the Sergeant-at-Arms of the House of Representatives (Kenneth Romney), entered the Chamber.

General Wainwright and the members of the committee proceeded to the seats assigned them immediately in front of the desk of the President pro tempore.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Members of the Senate, General Wainwright. [Prolonged applause, Senators and guests of the Senate rising.]

ADDRESS BY GEN. JONATHAN M. WAINWRIGHT

General WAINWRIGHT. Mr. President and Members of the Senate, I want to express to you the deep gratitude which I and my comrades feel for the honor you have conferred in bringing us here today. Since the hour when we were restored to our countrymen in Chungking we have been overwhelmed with kindness and consideration on every hand. It has been a moving experience. It has been such a spontaneous welcome as only the warmth of America could bring forth.

Through it all has run the sadness of remembering the brave men who fell in battle and those who died in foul prison camps of their captors' cruelty and neglect. It is a pitiful story, gentlemen. Some of it has already been told. I hope it may some day be revealed in all its ghastly detail. The American people must realize fully the nature of the enemy whom we knew so well. Only on a just consideration of his nature as it was revealed to us will we be able to decide such measures as must be taken to insure the future security of our country from his lust for power.

I am still living in a world of wonder. Out there in the Pacific since my liberation I have seen the strength of an aroused America arrayed against the Japanese. It has been a pleasant sight. You will understand, I feel sure, if I say that I gloried in it and in the humiliation of the Japanese leaders who surrendered abjectly on the deck of the battleship *Missouri*. [Applause.] Nothing could have moved me more than the invitation to be present at those ceremonies, and I hold as one of my treasured possessions the pen which General MacArthur first

touched to the document of surrender. [Applause.]

Later I had an almost more personal triumph when I stood at Baguio, on Luzon, while General Yamashita surrendered all the remaining Jap forces in the Philippines. My only regret was that General Homma could not have been present. [Applause.] It was to him that I was forced to surrender the remnants of the gallant American Army which had fought him on Bataan and Corregidor.

It is good to stand on American soil again and, in this Chamber, to thank you and the American people for all you have done to welcome us back. Through these receptions and ceremonies we realize how well you remembered us during the bleak years when we were allowed no word of your warmth and anxiety. In the name of all my comrades, I thank you.

Following his address, General Wainwright was escorted to a position on the floor of the Senate and was there greeted by Members of the Senate, who were introduced to him by Mr. BARKLEY.

Following the informal reception General Wainwright and the distinguished visitors accompanying him were escorted from the Chamber.

RECESS

Following the recess and the reception to General Wainwright, the Senate (at 3 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.), under the order previously entered on request of Mr. BARKLEY, took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, September 11, 1945, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate September 10, 1945:

THE JUDICIARY

William E. Orr, of Nevada, to be judge of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, vice Hon. Curtis D. Wilbur, retired.

Hon. Delbert E. Metzger, of Hawaii, to be United States district judge for the district of Hawaii. (Judge Metzger is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired August 5, 1945.)

Ben H. Rice, Jr., of Texas, to be United States district judge for the western district of Texas, vice Hon. Walter A. Keeling, deceased.

Martin Pence, of Hawaii, to be a judge of the third circuit, circuit courts, Territory of Hawaii, vice Hon. Ray J. O'Brien, resigned.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

Thomas J. Morrissey, of Colorado, to be United States attorney for the district of Colorado. (Mr. Morrissey is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired July 23, 1945.)

George Earl Hoffman, of Florida, to be United States attorney for the northern district of Florida. (Mr. Hoffman is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired July 23, 1945.)

Herbert S. Phillips, of Florida, to be United States attorney for the southern district of Florida. (Mr. Phillips is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired June 26, 1944.)

John P. Cowart, of Georgia, to be United States attorney for the middle district of Georgia, vice Hon. T. Hoyt Davis, resigned.

John A. Carver, of Idaho, to be United States attorney for the district of Idaho.

(Mr. Carver is now serving in this office under an appointment which expires July 23, 1945.)

B. Howard Caughran, of Indiana, to be United States attorney for the southern district of Indiana. (Mr. Caughran is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired February 20, 1945.)

Malcolm E. Lafargue, of Louisiana, to be United States attorney for the western district of Louisiana. (Mr. Lafargue is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired May 17, 1945.)

David E. Henderson, of North Carolina, to be United States attorney for the western district of North Carolina, vice Theron Lamar Caudle, resigned.

Whitfield Y. Mauzy, of Oklahoma, to be United States attorney for the northern district of Oklahoma. (Mr. Mauzy is now serving in this office under an appointment which expires October 30, 1945.)

Henry L. Hess, of Oregon, to be United States attorney for the district of Oregon, vice Carl C. Donagh, term expired.

Joseph A. McNamara, of Vermont, to be United States attorney for the district of Vermont. (Mr. McNamara is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired July 3, 1945.)

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

Edward B. Doyle, of Georgia, to be United States marshal for the middle district of Georgia. (Mr. Doyle is now serving in this office under an appointment which expires July 23, 1945.)

Joseph Henry Young, of Georgia, to be United States marshal for the southern district of Georgia. (Mr. Young is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired June 3, 1945.)

H. Chess Richardson, of Louisiana, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Louisiana. (Mr. Richardson is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired May 17, 1945.)

Louis E. LeBlanc, of Louisiana, to be United States marshal for the western district of Louisiana. (Mr. LeBlanc is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired May 17, 1945.)

Granville T. Norris, of Oklahoma, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Oklahoma. (Mr. Norris is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired May 12, 1945.)

Dave E. Hilles, of Oklahoma, to be United States marshal for the western district of Oklahoma. (Mr. Hilles is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired February 28, 1945.)

Stanford C. Stiles, of Texas, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Texas. (Mr. Stiles is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired February 28, 1945.)

Guy McNamara, of Texas, to be United States marshal for the western district of Texas. (Mr. McNamara is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired July 3, 1945.)

CALIFORNIA DEBRIS COMMISSION

Brig. Gen. Philip G. Bruton, Corps of Engineers, United States Army, for appointment as President, California Debris Commission provided for by the act of Congress approved March 1, 1893, entitled "An act to create the California Debris Commission and regulate hydraulic mining in the State of California," vice Col. Edwin C. Kelton, Corps of Engineers, to be relieved.

Col. Lester F. Rhodes, Corps of Engineers, United States Army, for appointment as member and secretary of the California Debris Commission provided for by the act of Congress approved March 1, 1893, entitled "An act to create the California Debris Commission and regulate hydraulic mining in the State of California," vice Col. Robert C. Hunter, Corps of Engineers, to be relieved.

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Clarence Lionel Adcock (lieutenant colonel, Corps of Engineers), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Albert Francis Hegenberger, (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Wallace C. Philoon (colonel, Infantry), United States Army.

To be brigadier generals

Col. Edward Allen Noyes, Medical Corps. Col. Winfred George Skelton (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States. Chaplain (Col.) William Donoghue Cleary, United States Army.

Col. James Keller Herbert (captain, Corps of Engineers), Army of the United States.

Col. Erle Oden Sandlin (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Luther Remi Moore, Medical Corps.

Col. Robert Kinder Taylor (major, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Sidney Lovett Chappell, Medical Corps.

Col. Robert Morris Hardaway, Medical Corps.

Col. James Dennett McIntyre (lieutenant colonel, Ordnance Department), Army of the United States.

Col. Clyde McKay Beck, Medical Corps.

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Ralph Maxwell Immell (brigadier general, Adjutant General's Department, National Guard of the United States), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Carl Raymond Gray, Junior (colonel, Corps of Engineers Reserve), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Frank Edward Lowe (colonel, Field Artillery Reserve), Army of the United States, to rank from Sept. 7, 1943.

To be brigadier generals

Col. Edward Sedley Bres, Corps of Engineers Reserve.

Col. Donald Bennett Adams (lieutenant colonel, Corps of Engineers Reserve), Army of the United States.

Col. George Abbott Brownell (temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. William Claire Menninger, Army of the United States.

Col. Luther Lyons Hill (temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. James Fenton McManmon (temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To Adjutant General's Department

Lt. Col. Joseph Magoffin Glasgow, Cavalry (temporary colonel), with rank from December 11, 1942.

To Quartermaster Corps

Maj. Paul Leroy Carroll, Infantry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1943.

First Lt. Amos George Johnson, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 1, 1941.

To Finance Department

Capt. James Francis Stroker, Field Artillery (temporary colonel), with rank from June 11, 1941.

To Ordnance Department

Lt. Col. Shirley Wiggins McIlwain, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from August 18, 1940.

To Field Artillery

Capt. Bernard Sanders Waterman, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1945.

Second Lt. Alan Lyon Partridge, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1944.

Second Lt. Paul James Reinhalter, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 1, 1943.

To Infantry

First Lt. James Moore Boyd, Air Corps (temporary major), with rank from July 1, 1944.

First Lt. Robert Jerome Delaney, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major), with rank from June 11, 1943.

First Lt. Philip Martin Royce, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major), with rank from June 12, 1942.

First Lt. Joel Terry Walker, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1942.

To Air Corps

Lt. Col. Tom Christopher Rives, Signal Corps (temporary brigadier general), with rank from August 7, 1940.

Capt. William Fulton McKee, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary brigadier general), with rank from June 13, 1939.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be colonels with rank from August 1, 1945

Lt. Col. Howard J. Houghland, Air Corps (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. John Lawrence Dunn, Infantry (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. James Gregory Monihan, Cavalry (temporary colonel), subject to examination required by law.

To be captains with rank from August 1, 1945

First Lt. Opal Ellis Henderson, Air Corps (temporary colonel).

First Lt. Daniel Ira Moler, Air Corps (temporary colonel).

First Lt. Lawrence Owen Brown, Air Corps (temporary colonel).

First Lt. Henry Bishop Fisher, Air Corps (temporary colonel).

First Lt. Clayton Baxter Claassen, Air Corps (temporary colonel).

First Lt. William Thomas Hudnell, Jr., Air Corps (temporary colonel).

First Lt. Harold Lawrence Kreider, Air Corps (temporary colonel).

First Lt. John Oman Neal, Air Corps (temporary colonel).

First Lt. Henry Agnew Sebastian, Air Corps (temporary colonel).

First Lt. Harrison Schermerhorn Markham, Chemical Warfare Service (temporary lieutenant colonel).

MEDICAL CORPS

To be majors

Capt. Heinz Kuraner, Medical Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from August 5, 1945.

Capt. Emmett Leroy Kehoe, Medical Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from August 9, 1945.

Capt. Knox Dunlap, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from September 1, 1945.

Capt. Stephen Dominic Berardinelli, Medical Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from September 2, 1945.

Capt. William Joseph Power, Medical Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from September 9, 1945.

Capt. Jacob Reil Till, Jr., Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from September 15, 1945.

Capt. Lawrence Carter Ball, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from September 18, 1945.

Capt. Richard Leland Bohannon, Medical Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from September 22, 1945.

Capt. John Knox Cullen, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from September 24, 1945.

To be captains

First Lt. John Hawes Ames, Medical Corps (temporary captain), with rank from August 1, 1945.

First Lt. Harold Victor Ellingson, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from August 1, 1945.

First Lt. Joseph Negley Schaeffer, Medical Corps (temporary captain), with rank from August 17, 1945.

First Lt. Alfred Sjouke Blauw, Medical Corps (temporary captain), with rank from September 1, 1945.

DENTAL CORPS

To be colonel

Lt. Col. Albert Fields, Dental Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from August 18, 1945.

To be lieutenant colonel

Maj. Harold George Ott, Dental Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from August 18, 1945.

VETERINARY CORPS

To be lieutenant colonels

Maj. Verne Clifford Hill, Veterinary Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from August 19, 1945.

Maj. Elmer William Young, Veterinary Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from August 19, 1945.

CHAPLAINS

To be colonels

Chaplain (Lt. Col.) William Roy Bradley, United States Army (temporary colonel), with rank from August 24, 1945.

Chaplain (Lt. Col.) James Lloyd McBride, United States Army (temporary colonel), with rank from August 26, 1945.

Chaplain (Lt. Col.) Mylon Dickinson Merchant, United States Army (temporary colonel), with rank from September 1, 1945.

Chaplain (Lt. Col.) Maurice William Reynolds, United States Army (temporary colonel), with rank from September 8, 1945.

To be major

Chaplain (Capt.) Stanley Joseph Relly, United States Army (temporary major), with rank from August 21, 1945, subject to examination required by law.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

Col. Samuel L. Howard to be a brigadier general in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from the 30th day of March 1942.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate September 10, 1945:

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION (TERMS OF 6 YEARS FROM SEPTEMBER 6, 1945)

Leo T. Crowley
Phillips Lee Goldsborough

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 10, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord God of the ages, the eyes of whose glory cannot look upon iniquity, be merciful unto us. Bow down Thine ear and hear us, for we are poor and needy. Grant that our light may never fade into darkness, nor our goodness lose its vitality. With Thy divine presence we pray Thee to magnify Thy grace in

us by clothing us with self-restraint, and with true hearts bend ourselves to our country's needs.

We thank Thee for the rejoicing of this day, as the whole aspect of our national life is stirred by the chivalrous deeds of him whom we seek to honor. Through his unyielding devotion to the right, with his intrepid comrades in arms, the discouraged and the broken, the weak and abandoned peoples have become jubilant as they rehearse their hope and faith in the blessings that are to come. In this challenging hour, let us, who have suffered least, in nowise fail them or cease to care for them, but walk with them beneath the burdens they bear. Animate us with the faith of all those heroic souls who made possible the future of our Republic, who transformed cruel defeat into abiding victory. Through Jesus Christ our triumphant Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, September 6, 1945, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a concurrent resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 27. Concurrent resolution to investigate the attack on Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941, and events and circumstances relating thereto.

VICE ADMIRAL JOHN SIDNEY MCCAIN

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, it becomes my sad duty to announce to the House the death of one of Mississippi's most illustrious sons, and one of the great heroes of this war, Vice Admiral John Sidney McCain, who passed away at San Diego, Calif., on Thursday, September 6, and was buried with appropriate honors in Arlington Cemetery this morning.

Admiral McCain was born on August 9, 1884, in Carroll County, Miss. He attended high school at Carrollton, and the University of Mississippi before his appointment to the United States Naval Academy on September 25, 1902, by Senator A. J. McLauren—the first cadet ever appointed by a United States Senator to the Academy. Prior to that time they had been appointed by Representatives in Congress only.

He graduated from the Academy in February 1906, and his first naval duty was on Asiatic service with the U. S. S. *Ohio*, the U. S. S. *Baltimore*, and the U. S. S. *Panay*—that famous gunboat which was sunk by the Japs early in this war, while the Japanese were fighting China alone.

Admiral McCain served with distinction in the First World War.

He became an aviator at the age of 52, and in the present war led the Navy's air forces to smashing victories over Japan.